

GATEWAY SEMINARY-BAY AREA



3 0008 00000 9685

LINCOLN HULLEY,
LEWISBURGH, PA.

Wm Morgan Patterson
8-15-60

S. J. Murdoch
Nelsonville

April 1887

4 vols for \$4.00

Gateway Seminary Library

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;
INCLUDING THAT OF
THE POPES
TO
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S

EIGHT VOLUMES IN FOUR.
VOLS. III., IV.

NEW YORK
A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON
714 BROADWAY
1883

Ref

BR

162

.M64

1883

v.3-4

UNIVERSITY PRESS:
JOHN WILSON & SON, CAMBRIDGE.

NEW YORK
A. C. WASHINGTON AND SON
1883

CONTENTS

OF

THE THIRD VOLUME.

BOOK V. (*continued.*)

CHAPTER III.

SARACENS IN ITALY.

A.D.		PAGE
844	Pope Sergius II. — Louis (son of Lothair) in Rome	15
847	Leo IV. Pope — Saracen invasion.....	18
	Benedict III.....	20

CHAPTER IV.

NICOLAS I. — IGNATIUS AND PHOTIUS.

857	Deposition of Ignatius — Elevation of Photius at Constantinople.....	24
858	Pope Nicolas I.....	26
862	Council at Constantinople.....	<i>ib.</i>
863	Second Council.....	29
	Photius.....	32
866	Michael the Drunkard.....	34
	Councils at Constantinople.....	35
867-877	Exile of Photius.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Reinstatement by Basil the Macedonian.....	36
879	Acknowledged by Pope John VIII.....	37
	Leo the Philosopher Emperor.....	<i>ib.</i>
861	John Archbishop of Ravenna.....	38
	Transalpine Hierarchy.....	40
860	Divorce of King Lothair.....	44

A.D.	PAGE
862 Pope Nicolas I. interfähres.....	47
864 Emperor Louis in Rome.....	48
Humiliation of great German prelates.....	49
Hincmar of Rheims.....	51
867 Death and character of Nicolas I.....	56
False decretals.....	58

CHAPTER V.

HADRIAN II.—HINCMAR OF RHEIMS.

867 Pope Hadrian II.....	67
869 Lothair at Rome — Death.....	68
870 Charles the Bald.....	70
Answer of Hincmar to the Pope.....	72
Prince Carloman.....	73
Hincmar of Laon.....	75
871 Punishment of Carloman and of Hincmar of Laon.....	79

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN VIII.—THE SARACENS—THE DUKES OF LOWER ITALY.

872 Charles the Bald Emperor.....	83
Danger from Saracens.....	84
The Dukes of Naples.....	87
878 Empire vacant.....	91
John VIII. in France — Anathemas.....	92
Boso King of Provence.....	96
881 Athanasius of Naples.....	98
882 Pope Marinus — Hadrian III. — Stephen V.....	101

CHAPTER VII.

ANARCHY OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE PAPACY.

Berengar and Guido claim the Empire.....	103
891 Pope Formosus.....	105
894 Emperor Arnulf in Italy — Coronation.....	106

A.D.		PAGE
896	Boniface VII. — Stephen VI.....	110
	Rapid succession of Popes — Romanus — Theodorus	
	— John IX.....	112

CHAPTER VIII.

CONVERSION OF BULGARIA.

863-4	King Bogoris — Cyril — Methodius.....	116
	Questions answered by Pope Nicolas I.....	118
	Moravia.....	123
	Use of Slavian language.....	124

CHAPTER IX.

THE NORTHMEN.

	Their ravages.....	129
	Religion.....	134
	St. Anschar.....	136

CHAPTER X.

ALFRED.

	The Danes.....	144
	Anglo-Saxon letters.....	146

CHAPTER XI.

THE HUNGARIANS — DEGRADATION OF THE PAPACY.

	Hungarian inroad.....	149
	Abasement of the Papacy.....	151
	Benedict IV. — Leo V.....	154
897	Sergius III. Pope — Marquisate of Tuscany.....	157
	Theodora and Marozia.....	158
924	John X.....	160
926	Hugh of Provence.....	165

A.D.		PAGE
931	Marriage with Marozia — John XI. Pope.....	167
	Alberic — Insurrection of Rome.....	169
936-941	Rapid Papal succession — Leo VII. — Stephen IX. — Marinus II. — Agapetus II.....	170
	John XII. — Octavian.....	174

CHAPTER XII.

THE OTHOS ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

951	Otho the Great in Italy.....	176
957	Berengar and Adalbert.....	177
961-2	Pope John XII. — Otho in Rome.....	178
	Council at Rome — Degradation of the Pope — Leo VIII.....	180
964	John XII. recovers his throne.....	183
965	Benedict — John XIII.....	184
	Liutprand in Constantinople.....	186
972	Death of Otho the Great — Benedict VI.....	187
974	Bonifazio Francone — Benedict VII.....	188
983	Death of Otho II.....	189
985	John XIV. — Bonifazio — John XV.....	<i>ib.</i>
996	Otho III. in Italy.....	193
	Gregory V.....	194
	Crescentius — John XVI. — Otho III. in Rome...	195

CHAPTER XIII.

OTHO III. — POPE SILVESTER II.

	Views of Otho.....	200
	Gerbert.....	202
	Hugh Capet King of France.....	205
987	Arnulf of Rheims.....	<i>ib.</i>
991	Council of Rheims.....	208
	Gerbert Archbishop.....	211
998	Council of Moisson.....	214
	Gerbert Archbishop of Ravenna.....	215
999	Gerbert Pope — Silvester II.....	216

A.D.	PAGE
1002 Death of Otho III.....	218
1003 Death of Silvester II.....	220

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TUSCULAN POPES.

1003-12 John XVII. — John XVIII. — Sergius IV.....	222
Counts of Tusculum — Benedict VIII.....	223
1022 John XIX.....	227
1033 Benedict IX.....	229
Silvester III. — Gregory VI. buys the Papacy....	230
1044 Emperor Henry III. — Degradation of Benedict IX. and of Gregory VI.....	232



BOOK VI.

CHAPTER I.

THE GERMAN POPES.

1046 Clement II.....	236
1047 Council at Rome — Death of Clement.....	237
1048 Election and Death of Damascus II.....	239
1048 Leo IX.....	240
Enters Rome.....	242
1049 Peter Damiani.....	245
Leo's visitation beyond the Alps — in Cologne....	247
At Rheims — Council.....	251
The French hierarchy.....	252
Council at Mentz.....	255

CHAPTER II.

BERENGAR OF TOURS.

Transubstantiation.....	258
John Scotus Erigena.....	261

A.D.		PAGE
	Lanfranc	263
1050	Council at Rome — at Vercelli.....	264
1054	Hildebrand at Tours.....	267
1051	Leo's second Transalpine visitation.....	268
1052	Leo's third visitation.....	271
	Conversion of Hungary.....	<i>ib.</i>
1000-1036	St. Stephen.....	<i>ib.</i>
1052	The Emperor's unsuccessful campaign in Hun- gary.....	272
	Pope Leo at Worms.....	273
1053	Council at Mantua.....	275
1053	Leo's campaign against the Normans — defeat...	276
1054	Captivity and death.....	281

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUATION OF GERMAN POPES.

1055	Gebhard of Eichstadt — Pope Victor II.....	284
	Council at Florence.....	287
1056	Death of the Emperor Henry III.....	288
1057	Council at Florence.....	289
	Death of Pope Victor II.....	290
	Stephen IX. Pope (Frederick of Lorraine).....	291
	Legate (formerly) at Constantinople.....	<i>ib.</i>
1058	Illness and death.....	294
1058-9	Nicolas II. Pope — (Benedict X. Antipope)....	296
1059	Second Lateran Council — Papal election trans- ferred to Cardinals.....	297
	Berengar condemned.....	300
	Norman alliance.....	301
1061	Death of Nicolas II.....	303
868-881	Archbishops of Milan — Anspert.....	305
1018	Archbishop Héribert.....	306
	Archbishop Guido.....	312
	Marriage of clergy at Milan.....	313
	Landulph — Ariald.....	315
1059	Peter Damiani.....	318
1061	Anselm of Badagio, Pope Alexander II.....	321

A.D.		PAGE
	Honorius II. (Cadalous) Antipope.....	322
	Benzo, Bishop of Albi.....	323
	Revolution in Germany — Hanno of Cologne...	328
1062	Council of Augsburg.....	331
1063	Pope and Antipope in Rome.....	334
	Adalbert of Bremen.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Plunder of German Abbeys.....	336
	Overthrow of Adalbert.....	339
1064	Council of Mantua.....	341
	Strife at Milan about married clergy — Herlembald.....	342
1075-6	Strife at Florence.....	350
1073	Death of Alexander II. — Gregory VII.....	353

BOOK VII.

CHAPTER I.

HILDEBRAND.

	Progress of the Papacy.....	361
	Birth and youth of Hildebrand.....	364
	Peter Damiani.....	367
	Views of Hildebrand — Hierarchical caste.....	369
	Simony.....	370
	Celibacy of the clergy.....	377
	Married Clergy.....	378
	England — St. Dunstan.....	382
	Monks and secular clergy.....	386
1074	Gregory's synod at Rome.....	388
	Gregory and the King of France.....	390
	Gregory and England.....	391
	Gregory and Spain.....	393
	Hungary, Bohemia, &c.....	394

CHAPTER II.

KING HENRY IV.—CANOSA.

A.D.		PAGE
	The Papacy and the Empire.....	395
	Excommunication.....	399
	Character of Henry IV.....	403
1073	Saxon revolt.....	404
	Neutrality of the Pope.....	406
	Embassy from Rome.....	409
1074	German prelates — Synod of Erfurt.....	410
1075	Council at Rome — Investitures.....	416
	Breach between Henry IV. and the Pope.....	417
	Effects of decree against married clergy.....	419
	Hatred against Hildebrand.....	423
	Pope seized by Cencius.....	425
1076	Hildebrand's declaration against King Henry.....	427
	Synod of Worms — Pope deposed.....	430
	Third Lateran Council.....	433
	Henry deposed.....	437
	William of Utrecht.....	439
	Diet at Mentz.....	442
	Diet at Tribur.....	447
	Submission of Henry.....	450
	Gregory at Canosa.....	453
1077	Henry at Canosa.....	456

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUED STRIFE WITH KING HENRY.

	Growth of Henry's power.....	464
	Diet of Forcheim — Election of Rudolph of Swabia.....	467
1077-8	Henry in Germany.....	471
	Policy of Gregory.....	473
1079	Berengar of Tours.....	474
1080	Henry again excommunicated.....	478
	Gregory deposed at Mentz — Guibert of Ravenna	
	Antipope.....	482
	Battle of the Elster — Death of Rudolph.....	484

A.D.		PAGE
	Henry in Italy.....	485
1081-4	Three years' siege of Rome.....	487
1084	Succors from the Normans.....	491
1085	Henry master of Rome.....	492
	Normans take Rome — Insurrection — Massacre...	494
	Gregory's retirement and death.....	496

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORY'S SUCCESSORS.

	Victor III. (Desiderius of Monte Casino).....	501
	Countess Matilda.....	506
1087	Council of Benevento — Death of Victor III. ...	507

CHAPTER V.

URBAN II.

1088	Marriage of Countess Matilda.....	512
1090	Henry in Italy — Siege of Mantua.....	<i>ib.</i>
1093	Rebellion of Prince Conrad.....	514
1095	Council of Piacenza.....	517
	Urban II. in France.....	520
	Imperial interests revive in Italy.....	521
	Philip I. of France.....	524

HISTORY

OF

LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK V. (CONTINUED.)

CHAPTER III.

SARACENS IN ITALY.

THE Carolingian Empire expired with Louis the Pious. It separated, not so much into three kingdoms, as into three nations. Germany, France, and Italy, though governed each by a descendant of Charlemagne, and for a short time reunited under the sceptre of Charles the Fat, began to diverge more widely in their social institutions, in their form of government, in the manners and character of the people.

The imperial title was, in general, assumed by that one of the sons or grandsons of Louis the Pious ^{Lothair} who was master of Italy. First Lothair, and ^{Emperor.} then his son, Louis II., was Emperor, King of Italy, and Sovereign of the city of Rome. The right to ratify, if not the election, the consecration of the Pope, was among the imperial privileges asserted with the greatest rigor and determination.¹ At the close of the uneventful pontificate of Gregory IV., — uneventful as far as

¹ *Annal. Bertiniani.*

the affairs of Rome, not uneventful to those who could discern the slow but steady advancement of hierarchical pretensions¹ — the Emperor Lothair heard with indignation that the clergy and people of Rome had elected Sergius II., a Roman of noble birth, and from his youth trained in ecclesiastical duties; and that Sergius, contrary to the solemn treaty, had been at once consecrated, without awaiting his good pleasure.² The Romans had expelled John, a deacon, chosen by some of the low and rustic people.³ The haughty nobles had insisted on the condemnation of the audacious usurper. Sergius interposed to save his life. Again, we see the commonalty and the nobles in fierce strife; but the nobles, grown haughty, are less humbly imperialist. Lothair despatched immediately his son Louis with an army, and accompanied by Drogo Bishop of Metz, to punish, perhaps to degrade, the presumptuous prelate. The Franks, whose natural ferocity had not been abated by years of civil war, as if to show the resentment of the Emperor, committed frightful ravages. From the borders of the Roman territory to Bologna they advanced, wasting as they went, towards Rome. But Pope Sergius knew the strength of his position, and put forth all his religious grandeur to control the mind of the young invader. A fortunate tempest had already shaken the minds of the Franks: some of the followers of the Bishop of Metz had been struck dead by lightning, but still the army advanced with menacing haste.⁴

¹ See the famous letter of Gregory IV. ad Episcopos, written, it should seem, under the influence of the Abbot Wala. See note, vol. ii. p. 540.

² Anastasius, Vit. Sergii; Annal. Bertin. ad an. 844.

³ "Imperito et agresti populo." — Vit. Serg.

⁴ "Hoc videntes horribile signum nimis omnes timore Franci correpti

Nine miles from the city Louis was met by the civil authorities, with banners flying and loud acclamations, the military *schools*, or bands, and the people under their various standards, chanting hymns and songs of welcome. As he came nearer, the sacred crosses, which were usually reserved to grace the entrance of the Emperor into the city, were seen advancing towards him. Louis was seized with pious fear and joy at these unexpected honors. On the steps up to the church of St. Peter he was met and embraced by the Pope. They proceeded, Louis at the right hand of the Pope, to the silver-plated doors of the church, which, however, were jealously closed. Then the Pope, by the suggestion, it was said, of the Holy Ghost, addressed the king, — “Comest thou with a pure heart and mind for the welfare of the republic, and of the whole world, and of this Church? If so, I will command that the gates be opened; if otherwise, never, with my consent, shalt thou enter therein.” The king protested that he came with no hostile or evil intent. At the touch of the prelate the doors flew open, the whole clergy burst out in the accordant chant, “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” The Frank army, in the mean time, were not permitted to enter the city, the gates of which were strongly guarded by the militia of Rome. A few days after Louis was anointed King of Lombardy. The Franks insisted on the Pope and the patricians of Rome swearing fealty to the king. They resolutely refused to acknowledge any allegiance but to the Emperor himself.

The degraded archbishops, Ebbo of Rheims, Barthol-

sunt. Sed nullatenus mente ferocitatem deponentes, atroci voluntate ad urbem velociter properabant.” — Vit. Sergii.

omew of Narbonne, prayed to be restored to their sees and their honors; but Drogo of Metz, the brother and faithful adherent of Louis the Pious, was at the head of the Frankish army. The Pope would grant them the humiliating permission to communicate, but to communicate only with the common people. Drogo, Bishop of Metz, son of the glorious Emperor Charles the Great, was appointed with the fullest powers Vicar of the Pope beyond the Alps.¹

Sergius died after a pontificate of three years. An unforeseen necessity enforced the immediate election of his successor, Leo IV.² The impulse of Mohammedan invasion against the still narrowing boundaries of Christendom had by no means ceased. The Saracen fleets were masters of the Mediterranean.

Sicily, with the exception of Syracuse, which made a gallant defence for some years, was in their hands.³ They had conquered Calabria, were rapidly advancing northwards, and subduing the parts of the province which still owned allegiance to the Byzantine Empire.⁴ Rome herself beheld the Moslem at her gates; the suburban churches of St. Peter and St. Paul were plundered; the capital of Christendom was in danger of becoming a Mohammedan city.⁵ The

Jan. 27, 847.
Leo IV.

Saracen invasions.

¹ Vit. Sergii.

² It is observed that under Leo IV. the form of address of the papal letters is changed. With two exceptions, the name of the person addressed is placed after that of the Pope: the title Dominus is dropped. — Garnier, in Not. ad Lib. Pontiff. Planck, iii. p. 29.

³ The progress of the Saracens was aided by the feuds among the Lombard dukes. The princes of Spoleto and Benevento and Naples had been at continual war with each other. For details, see Anonym. Salernit.

⁴ Famin (*Histoire des Invasions des Sarrasins en Italie*) describes the conquest of Sicily, and the first invasions of Italy, c. iv. — *Annal. Met. An.* Bertin. sub ann. 846. Baronius sub ann.

⁵ Famin, p. 199

Moslemim retired on the advance of an army of Franks, according to some authorities, under the command of King Louis himself; but they retreated only to inflict a shameful defeat on the Christians, and then sat down to besiege Gaeta. The great riches of the monastery of Monte Casino escaped only by an opportune rising of the river Garigliano, attributed by the grateful Monks to a miracle.¹

But these terrible strangers might at any time return to invest the city of St. Peter. Whether to avert the danger by his prayers, to summon the Frank Protector with more commanding voice, or to strengthen the city by his administration, a Pope appeared instantly necessary to the nobles, clergy, and people of Rome.² With the utmost haste, but with reservation of the imperial rights, infringed only on account of the exigencies of the time, Leo IV. was elected, consecrated, Jan. 847.

and assumed the functions of Pope. The Romans were released from their immediate terrors by the destruction of the Saracen fleet in a tempest off Gaeta. Another legend ascribed this disaster to the insulted and plundered apostles.³

Leo's first care was to provide for the future security of the Vatican and the church of St. Peter. He car-

¹ The abbey, however, had already been plundered by Sicemulf, Duke of Benevento, on pretence of employing its wealth in the wars against the Saracens. The whole account is minute and curious. Anonym. *Salern.* apud Muratori, *Script. Ital.*, p. 266. According to Fassin, it was taken and plundered, A.D. 844; yet he quotes the statement of Baronius, which implies that it was first threatened by the Saracens in 846. — Baronius *sub ann.*

² "Hoc timore et futuro casu perterriti, cum sine permissione principis consecraverant: fidem quoque illius, sive honorem, post Deum per omnia æt in omnibus conservantes." — *Anastas. in Vit. Leon. IV.*

³ Baronius in loc

ried out the design, before entertained by Leo III., of forming a new suburb, surrounded by strong fortifications, on the right bank of the Tiber, which might at once protect the most hallowed edifice of Christendom, and receive the fugitives who might be driven from the city by hostile incursions, perhaps by civil insurrections. This part of Rome perpetuated the name of the Pope, as the Leonine city.

The eight years of Leo's papacy¹ were chiefly occupied in strengthening, in restoring the plundered and desecrated churches of the two apostles, and adorning Rome. The succession to Leo IV. was contested between Benedict III., who commanded the suffrages of the clergy and people, and Anastasius, who, at the head of an armed faction, seized the Lateran, stripped Benedict of his pontifical robes, and awaited the confirmation of his violent usurpation by the Imperial Legates, whose influence he thought that he had secured. But these Commissioners, after strict investigation, decided in favor of Benedict. Anastasius was expelled with disgrace from the Lateran, his rival consecrated in the presence of the Emperor's representatives. Anastasius, with unwonted mercy, was only degraded to lay communion.

Sept.
A.D. 855.

Sept. 29.

The Pontificate of Benedict III. is memorable chiefly for the commencement of the long strife between Ignatius and Photius for the see of Constantinople. This strife ended in the permanent schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.

¹ Leo died A.D. 855, July 17.

CHAPTER IV.

NICOLAS I. IGNATIUS AND PHOTIUS.

NICOLAS I., the successor of Benedict, was chosen rather by the favor of the Emperor Louis and his nobles than that of the clergy.¹ He has ^{April,} ^{A.D. 858.} been thought worthy to share the appellation of the Great with Leo I., with Gregory I., with Hildebrand, and with Innocent III. At least three great events signalized the pontificate of Nicolas I., — the strife of Photius with Ignatius for the archiepiscopal throne of Constantinople; the prohibition of the divorce of King Lothair from his Queen Theutberga; and the humiliation of the great prelates on the Rhine, the successful assertion of the papal supremacy even over Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. In the first two of these momentous questions, the contest about the see of Constantinople, and that of Lothair, King of Lorraine, with his wife Theutberga, Nicolas took his stand on the great eternal principles of justice, humanity, and sound morals. These were no questions of abstruse and subtle theology nor the assertion of dubious rights. In both cases the Pope was the protector of the feeble and the oppressed, the victims of calumny and of cruelty. The Bishop of Constantinople, unjustly deposed, persecuted, exiled, treated with the worst inhumanity, implored the

¹ Prudent. Trecens. apud Pertz, i. 142. Vit. Nicolai I.

judgment of the head of Western Christendom. A queen, not only deserted by a weak and cruel husband, but wickedly and falsely criminated by a council of bishops, obtained a hearing at the Court of Rome: her innocence was vindicated, her accusers punished, the king himself compelled to bow before the majesty of justice, made more venerable by religion. If in both cases the language of Nicolas was haughty and imperious, it was justified to the ears of men by the goodness of his cause. The lofty supremacy which he asserted over the see of Byzantium awoke no jealousy, being exerted in behalf of a blameless and injured prelate. If he treated the royal dignity of France with contempt, it had already become contemptible in the eyes of mankind; if he annulled by his own authority the decree of a national council, composed of the most distinguished prelates of Gaul, that council had already been condemned by all who had natural sympathies with justice and with innocence. Yet, though in both cases Nicolas displayed equal ability and resolution in the cause of right, the event of the two affairs was very different. The dispute concerning the Patriarchate of Constantinople ended in the estrangement, the alienation, the final schism between the East and West. It was the last time that the Pope was permitted authoritatively to interfere in the ecclesiastical affairs of the East. The excommunication of the Greek by the Latin Church was the final act of separation. In the West Nicolas established a precedent for control even over the private morals of princes. The vices of kings, especially those of France, became the stronghold of papal influence: injured queens and subjects knew to what quarter they might recur for justice or for revenge. And on this

occasion the Pope brought not only the impotent king, but the powerful clergy of Lorraine, beneath his feet. The great Bishops of Cologne and of Treves were reduced to abject humiliation.

The contention for the Patriarchate of Constantinople was, strictly speaking, no religious controversy, — it was the result of political intrigue and personal animosity. Ignatius, who became the Patriarch, was of imperial descent. In the revolution which dethroned his father, Michael Rhangabe, he had taken refuge, under the cowl of a monk, from the jealousy of Leo the Armenian. The monasteries in the islands of Platos, Hyathos, and Terebinthus, were peopled by the devout followers of Ignatius. They were the refuge of all who were persecuted for the worship of images; and to Ignatius, during that reign, the monkish and anti-Iconoclastic party looked up as a protector and a model of the austere virtue.¹ From these peaceful solitudes he had been summoned by the Empress Theodora, the mother and guardian of the Emperor Michael III. the Drunkard, to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. His devout zeal led him to rebuke the Cæsar Bardas for his incestuous life. Bardas had divorced his own wife, and lived publicly with his son's widow. Ignatius openly repelled him from the communion. So long as the Empress Theodora, the sister of Bardas, protected the Patriarch, the Cæsar had no hope of vengeance; his ambition as well as his vindictiveness urged him to involve them both in common ruin. He persuaded the young Emperor no longer to endure the disgrace of female rule; and, in order to secure the full exercise of

¹ It must be remembered that our chief authority is Nicetas, the biographer of Ignatius, as fervent an admirer as any adoring hagiologist.

authority, counselled him to remove not only his imperious mother, and even his sisters, from the Court, but to seclude them altogether from the world. The Patriarch was commanded to dedicate these unwilling votaries to a religious life. Ignatius appealed to the canons of the Church, which allowed no one to take the vows but of their own free will; and steadily resisted the Imperial commands. A groundless charge was soon invented of treasonable correspondence with Nov. 23, 857. a pretender to the Empire. Ignatius was banished to his old retreat in the island of Terebinthus. As no power or persuasion could induce him to resign his patriarchal dignity, he was declared to be deposed, and a new Patriarch appointed in his place.

Photius was chosen as his successor. Of illustrious birth,¹ having discharged all the great offices of the State with consummate ability, and risen to its very highest dignity, Photius was esteemed the most learned and accomplished man of his age. In grammar, oratory, even in physical science, in every branch of knowledge and letters, except poetry, he stood alone. His ambition was boundless as his industry and learning; and his acceptance of the Patriarchal See may show the transcendent estimation in which ecclesiastical dignity was held in the East as in the West. Photius Dec. 25, 857. was but a layman: in six successive days he passed through the inferior orders up to the Patriarchate.

The bishops, it is said, assented to the elevation of Photius on the express condition that he should treat his deposed rival with respect and generosity. But so

¹ The patriarch Tarasius was his great uncle; another uncle had married the sister of the Empress Theodora and of Bardas.

long as Ignatius had not consented to resign his See, the tenure of the Bishopric was insecure. Ignatius and the bishops of his party suffered every kind of wanton cruelty; their sacred persons were not revered; some were beaten and exiled to remote and inhospitable parts of the Empire. One accused of too great liberty of speech had his tongue cut out.¹ The high-born and blameless Patriarch himself was seized, carried away from his splendid and peaceful monastery, loaded with chains, hurried from one desolate place to another, and at last confined in Mitylene. Rival councils met, and the two Patriarchs were alternately excommunicated by the adverse spiritual factions.

Photius was the first to determine on an appeal to Rome. The Pope, he thought, would hardly resist the acknowledgment of his superiority, with the tempting promise of the total extirpation of the hated Iconoclasts. The Emperor sent a solemn embassy, entreating that Legates might be commissioned to assist him in his holy work, and to restore the decaying discipline. On the part of Photius four bishops were sent to assure the Pope that Ignatius, oppressed by age and infirmities, had retired from the Bishopric; that in his retirement he was treated with profound respect; that Photius had been lawfully chosen to the vacant See. He added the most humble asseverations of his own conscious unworthiness, and the strong reluctance with which he had undertaken the awful function. "The clergy, the bishops, the emperor, benignant to all, cruel to me alone, without listening to my entreaties, untouched

¹ Photius, in a remarkable letter to the Cesar, deprecates in the strongest terms these barbarities. Epist. vi.

by my tears, have compelled me to bear this heavy burden.”¹

Nicolas was no doubt better acquainted than was supposed with the state of ecclesiastical affairs in the East. He answered with caution and dignity, that his legates could only judge on the spot as to the validity of the very questionable ordination of Photius. In the presence of his legates and a lawful council Ignatius must Sept. 25, 860. acknowledge his resignation. In his reply to the Emperor, Nicolas seized the opportunity of reclaiming the estates of the Church in Sicily, and the jurisdiction over Illyricum, Epirus, Thessaly, and other parts of Greece, which had been usurped by the Archbishop of Thessalonica. Throughout the behavior and language of Nicolas there is no sign of admitted subjection to the Eastern Emperor: even its tradition seems forgotten. He writes as a great independent religious potentate, as the head of Christendom, treating the Emperor at first with the courtesy becoming a powerful sovereign, but not as one to whom himself owed allegiance.

The legates, with this calm and guarded reply, arrived at Constantinople, to the disappointment of Photius and of the Emperor. Photius was indignant that he was not acknowledged under his title of bishop; the Emperor received the legates, not as ambassadors from a foreign power, but as insolent subjects. They were imprisoned, threatened with banishment: they yielded

¹ Photii, Epist. i. ad Nicol. Papam. It has been reprinted in a *Vie de Photius*, by the Abbé Jager, one of those modern French works which would disdain the praise of candor and impartiality. I shall not accuse him of it. But M. Jager has the merit of justly appreciating the high merit of Photius, for his day most unusually accomplished as a scholar; and the extraordinary beauty of some of his letters, a merit very rare in Greek literature.

to these sterner or to milder means of persuasion, to direct bribery.¹ Ignatius was summoned to appear before a council in the presence of the papal legates. This council boasted that it was formed of exactly A.D. 802. the same number of prelates as sate in the venerable assembly at Nicea. The Patriarch's firmness for a time stayed the proceedings. He demanded who the legates were, and for what purpose they sate in Constantinople? They replied that they were the legates of Nicolas, the supreme pontiff, sent to judge his cause.² "First," answered the intrepid Patriarch, who appeared in the garb of a simple monk, "drive out the adulterer. If ye cannot, ye are no judges." He appealed to the Pope in person. The council pronounced his deposition; and as it were, to propitiate the Pope, in their second session condemned Iconoclasm. But this was not enough. Still all means of persuasion and cruelty were used to extort the resignation of Ignatius.³ At length, it is said, while he lay senseless in his prison,

¹ Anastasius (in Vit. Nicolai I.) and the Pope himself (Epist. x. ad Clerum Constantin.) assert distinctly that they were bribed. The most extraordinary menace was, that not only they should suffer exile, but be food for vermin from their own bodies. "*Longa exilia et diuturnas pediculorum comessationes.*" This might seem beneath the dignity of history, were it not in the Pope's own letter, and so, it should seem, rests on the authority of the legates themselves. — Also, Phot. Epist. vi. p. 286.

² The legates suppressed the parts of the Pope's letter which warned them to decide nothing, and read only that which related to the Iconoclasts.

³ If we are to believe the monkish writers, the cruelty of all orders, even to ecclesiastics of the highest rank, shows a most savage state of manners. The ingenious tortures inflicted on Ignatius, it is said, by command of the Emperor and of Photius, are absolutely revolting. Another respectable prelate, who had been Bishop of Crete at the time of the Saracen conquest, now become Bishop of Thessalonica, ventured during an earthquake to remonstrate with the young Emperor against his profane mimicry of the religious ceremonies of the Church, he was beaten so as to knock out two of his teeth, and scourged almost to death. — Nicet. Vit. Ignat. Labbe, p. 1218.

his unconscious hand was forced to trace the sign of a cross on a blank paper, on which Photius superscribed a confession of his uncanonical election to the Patriarchate, which he had ruled as an usurper and a tyrant. In possession of this document, Photius allowed his rival a short interval of repose.¹ He was permitted to retire to a palace which had belonged to his mother. Rumors of new and more horrible persecutions meditated against him induced him to fly from the capital.² He found means to baffle his pursuers; till an earthquake, as in the time of his great predecessor, Chrysostom, shook Constantinople with guilty dread, and seemed the voice of Heaven rebuking the unjust usage of the Patriarch. He was permitted to return to the city.

In the mean time the sentence of his deposition by the Synod of Constantinople had been communicated to the Pope, with a letter of great length from Photius.³ The Pope took at once the highest ground. He summoned a council of the Roman Church; disclaimed his

¹ Photius is accused of forgery, or of conniving at the forgery of two favorable letters from the Pope. The trick was detected by the Cæsar Bardas. — Nicet. in Vit.

² Among the cruelties and insults which Photius is charged with heaping on his rival, he is said to have given him up shamelessly to the mockery of mimes and stage-players. "Et ad illudendum mimis et scenicis inverecundè proderes." — Nicol. ad Phot. Epist. x. p. 372.

³ Part of this letter is striking and beautiful. Photius describes, with seeming sincerity, the enjoyments of his state as a layman, in the society of his attached friends and the quiet study of letters, and his profound regret that he had abandoned those more congenial occupations. *ἐξέπεσον εἰρηνικῆς ζωῆς, ἐξέπεσον γαλήνης γλυκείας, ἐξέπεσον δὲ καὶ δόξης (εἶπερ τισὶ καὶ κοσμικῆς δόξης ἔφεσις), ἐξέπεσον τῆς φίλης ἡσυχίας, τῆς καθαρῆς ἐκείνης καὶ ἡδίστης μετὰ τῶν πλησίων συνουσίας, τῆς ἀλύπου, καὶ ἀδόλου, καὶ ἀνεπιπλήκτου συναποστροφῆς.* The latter part vindicates his sudden promotion from the rank of a layman to the patriarchate, by the unanswerable examples of his predecessors Nestorius and Tarasius, and that of St. Ambrose of Milan.

weak and unauthorized legates, and in the presence of the imperial ambassador refused his consent to the deposal of Ignatius, to the elevation of Photius.

Not merely did he address two lofty and condemnatory letters to the Emperor and to Photius, A.D. 862. but a third, also, to "the faithful in the East," at the close of which he made known to the three Eastern Patriarchs his steadfast resolution to maintain the cause of Ignatius, to refuse the recognition of the usurper Photius. He called upon them to concur in the decrees of the Apostolic See.

Early in the next year a monk named Theognetus, a messenger of Ignatius, appeared in Rome with the full account of all the hard usage endured by his A.D. 863. master. A more august council was now summoned, of which the first act was to degrade and excommunicate Zacharias, one of the papal legates, for his weakness in consenting to the deposition of Ignatius. The Pope then pronounced the unanimous sentence of condemnation against Photius; recounting his Decree against Photius. offences, and involving under the same anathema Gregory, Bishop of Syracuse, who had presumed to consecrate the usurper of the Constantinopolitan See.¹ All the acts of Photius, especially his ordinations, were declared null and void. The restoration of Ignatius was commanded even in more imperious language, and under more awful sanctions. "We, by the power committed to us by our Lord through St. Peter, restore our brother Ignatius to his former station, to his see, to

¹ Nicolas neglected no means of carrying his point. He did not disdain female influence. Besides letters to the clergy of the East, and to the senate of Constantinople, he wrote to the mother and to the wife of the Emperor to maintain the cause of Ignatius, to reject the adulterer of the see the usurper, the neophyte Photius. — Epist. Nicol. I.

his dignity as Patriarch, and to all the honors of his office. Whoever, after the promulgation of this decree, shall presume to disturb him in the exercise of his office, separate from his communion, or dare to judge him anew, without the consent of the Apostolic See, if a clerk, shall share the eternal punishment of the traitor Judas; if a layman he has incurred the malediction of Canaan: he is excommunicate, and will suffer the same fearful sentence from the eternal Judge."

Never had the power of the clergy or the supremacy of Rome been asserted so distinctly, so inflexibly. The privileges of Rome were eternal, immutable, anterior to, derived from no synod or council, but granted directly by God himself: they might be assailed, but not transferred; torn off for a time, but not plucked up by the roots. An appeal was open to Rome from all the world, from her authority lay no appeal.¹

The Emperor and Constantinople paid no regard to these terrible anathemas of the Pope. As long as he possessed the favor of the Emperor, Photius remained in undisturbed possession of his see. An angry correspondence was kept up between the Emperor and the Pope. In the Emperor's letter he seems (for his letter is only known by the Pope's reply) to have addressed the Pope as a refractory and contumacious subject. He threatens Rome itself with fire and sword. Nicolas

¹ The Emperor, it appears, had demanded that his disloyal subject, the monk Theognetus, the messenger of Ignatius to Rome, should be delivered up. "Many thousands," replies the Pope, "come to Rome every year, and place themselves devoutly under the protection of St. Peter. We have the power of summoning monks, and even clergy, from every part of the world: you, O Emperor, have no such power; you have nothing to do with monks, but humbly to entreat their prayers." Never would he surrender to a worldly sovereign a monk, who by his profession declared his contempt for palaces, for all the honors, dignities, and gifts which kings could bestow.

maintains his haughty independence,¹ treats these idle menaces with contempt. He significantly reminds the Emperor of the fate of Sennacherib; and tauntingly reproaches him with his dastardly submission to the Saracens. “We have not invaded Crete; we MAY 25. 865 have not depopulated Sicily; we have not subdued the countless provinces of Greece; we have not burned the churches in the very suburbs of Constantinople; yet, while these pagans conquer, waste, burn with impunity, we Catholic Christians are menaced with the vain terrors of your arms. Ye release Barabbas, and put Christ to death.” Nicolas concludes with evoking the whole cause to Rome, cites the two conflicting parties, Ignatius and Photius at least by his representative, as well as the other bishops personally, to submit Nov. 13. 865. themselves to his tribunal. On the faithful fulfilment of these terms, he will condescend to allow the Emperor to communicate with the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, with himself specially, and his brother priest, Ignatius. In conclusion, he ominously reminds him of the fate of the Emperors, the persecutors of the Church, Nero, Dioclesian, Constantius, Anastasius; the glory of those who have been its faithful friends and servants. In another letter—the strife was now dragging on its fourth year—Nicolas enjoins the Emperor to burn the blasphemous and filthy letter with which he has dared

¹ The Emperor (or was it the insolence of the Greek scholar Photius?) had spoken of the Latin language as a barbarous Scythian jargon. The indignant Pope replies, that to censure that language is to censure its maker, God: that it was one of the languages inscribed on the cross; that the Scythians are idolaters, and only use Latin to worship God; that some of the services even in the churches of Constantinople were in Latin. “Let the Emperor cease to call himself Emperor of the Romans, or abstain from insulting the Roman language.” It is curious to see Latin on the defensive.

to insult the Holy See ; if he refuses, the Pope will himself summon an assembly of prelates, anathematize all who favor or maintain these documents, and, to his eternal disgrace, cause the Emperor's missive publicly to be suspended over a slow fire in the sight of all the nations who reverence the throne of St. Peter.

At length Photius determined to keep no terms with Photius. his unrelenting adversary. The letters no doubt of the Emperor asserted, among other blasphemies, so called at Rome, the independence of the Byzantine See. He must now maintain that independence. All his submission, the tempting lure which he had offered, the total suppression of Iconoclasm, had been treated with scorn : he had found himself strangely mistaken in the man whom he had found in the papal chair ; he might have supposed Nicolas, like one of his immediate predecessors, only the head of a faction in Rome, the timid vassal of the Western Emperor. Nicolas, as he knew, was involved in the strife with King Louis, on account of the repudiation of his wife.

Pope Nicolas was now the aggressor. Bardas, the protector of Photius, suspected or known to aspire to the Empire, had been cut to pieces.¹ Michael ruled alone, or rather had surrendered the rule to Basil the Macedonian, soon to supplant him in the Empire. A new legation arrived at Constantinople : it demanded Nov. 866. that Photius and Ignatius should be sent to Rome for judgment. But Photius had changed with the times ; his skilful flatteries had secured the protection of Michael, or he was too strong not to be protected. The fame, the accomplishments, the acknowl-

¹ A letter to Bardas likewise appears ; it must, I think, be of earlier date. Nicolas can hardly have been ignorant of his fate six months before.

edged eloquence,¹ even the virtues of Photius, had now obtained great influence with all orders.

In the year 867 he had summoned a council at Constantinople: the obsequious prelates listened Synod at Constantinople. to the arraignment, and joined in the counter excommunication, of Pope Nicolas. Photius drew up eight articles inculcating in one the faith, in the rest the departure of the See of Rome from ancient and canonical discipline.² Among the dreadful acts of heresy and schism which were to divide forever the Churches of the East and West were: — I. The observance of Saturday as a fast. II. The permission to eat milk or cheese during Lent. IV. The restriction of the chrism to the Bishops. VI. The promotion of deacons at once to the Episcopal dignity. VII. The consecration of a lamb, according to the hated Jewish usage. VIII. The shaving of their beards by the clergy. The fifth only of the articles objected by Photius, the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, was an error so awful as to deserve a thousand anathemas. The third, condemning the enforced celibacy of the clergy, was alone of high moral or religious importance. “From this usage we see, in the West,” says Photius, “so many children who know not their fathers.” These, however, were but the pretexts for division. The cause lay deeper, in the total denial of the papal supremacy by the Greeks; their unequivocal assertion that with the empire that supremacy had passed to Constantinople.³

¹ The young, it is said, crowded in rapture to the schools, where he still delivered his attractive lectures.

² These were mostly the points of difference which in his letter to Nicolas he had treated as of no importance.

³ “Cum etiam gloriantur et perhibeant quando de Romanâ urbe Impera-

The decree of the council boasted the signature of the Emperor (obtained, it was said, in an hour of drunkenness); of Basil the Macedonian, averred (most improbably) to have been forged; of the three Eastern Patriarchs; of the senate and the great officers; of abbots and Bishops to the number of nearly one thousand.

But the Episcopal messenger who was to bear to Rome this defiance of the Church of Constantinople and the counter-excommunication of the Pope, had proceeded but a short way on his journey when he was stopped by the orders of the new Emperor. A revolution in the palace was a revolution in the Church of Constantinople. The Drunkard was an ill-omened name for the patron of a Bishop—and the drunkenness of Michael aggravated rather than excused his profane diversions. It was said to be his common amusement to mimic with low and dissolute companions the holiest rites of the Church. This unworthy monarch Sept. 24, 867. was hurled from his throne; another Emperor ruled in the East. The first act of Basil the Macedonian was to depose Photius. Photius is said to have refused the communion to the murderer Basil. From this time a succession of changes agitated the Empire: Photius rose or fell at each successive change.¹

A hostile council was assembled; among these were

tores Constantinopolin sunt translati, hinc et primatum Romanæ sedis ad Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam transmigrasse, et cum dignitatibus regiis etiam ecclesiæ Romanæ privilegia. — Epist. lxx. Nicol. I. ad Hincmar. p. 472.

¹ There is a very curious account in Nicetas of two books said to have been found in the possession of Photius; one, illustrated with caricatures, of the life and acts of Ignatius; one the account of the Council of Constantinople. They were produced and trampled under foot at Rome. One, it is said, was translated into Latin.

ecclesiastics, appearing as representatives of ^{Council of} the three Patriarchates now under the Mo-^{Constanti-}^{nople.}ammedan sway, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.¹ The legates of the Pope, Hadrian, who had already received the ambassadors of the Emperor, condemned Photius, and approved the restoration of Ig-^{First sitting,}^{Oct. 5, 849.}natius, were present. No one was permitted to take his seat till he had signed a formulary anathematizing all heretics, Iconoclasts, and Photius, and also condemnatory of the late council. Those who had communicated with the usurper were received only after having done penance. Some contumacious prelates, who refused to prejudge the cause which they were assembled to consider, were ignominiously expelled from the council.² All the ordinations of Photius were declared void. The crimes, the calumnies of Photius, who was dragged before the council by the Emperor's guard, were rehearsed before his face. He stood mute: his degradation was at once determined; and so fierce was the resentment, that, not content with dipping their pens in the ink with which they were to sign his condemnation, they wrote it in the Sacramental wine, as it is plainly said, in the blood of Christ.³ The biographer of Ignatius bitterly deplores the lenity of the council; he does not explain what measures he wished them to adopt, but to their mistimed tenderness he ascribes all the evils of the second elevation of Photius. He

¹ The representatives of these sees at the Council of Photius are of course impostors; those at the present real and authentic representatives. This is received as the eighth General Council by the Latin Church.

² Yet Photius found some defenders; Euthimius, Bishop of Cæsarea, Zacharias of Chalcedon.

³ ἀλλὰ τὸ φρικωδέστατον, ὡς καὶ εἰδότες ἀκήκοα διαβεβαιουμένων, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Σωτῆρος τῷ αἵματι βάπτοντες τὸν κάλαμον — Nicet. Vit. Ignat. p. 1231.

interprets a terrible earthquake, which threw down many churches, and a furious tempest, as the remonstrances of Heaven against this weak leniency. Other signs, on the same authority, glorified the restoration of Ignatius. By a new kind of Transubstantiation, the consecrated bread glowed like a live coal from heaven, and the cross over the altar was agitated by a gentle motion.

Photius, in his exile, heard of this appalling earthquake. He rejoiced that he was relieved from beholding the sufferings of his people; he is strongly tempted even to suggest that it is a protest of Heaven against the injustice done to him by the council. That council, in his epistles, he treats as a violent, unjust, lawless synod; a synod of furious bacchanals, avowedly met not to judge, but to ratify his predetermined condemnation. A.D. 867-877. For ten years Ignatius ruled in peace.¹ On his death there was a strange reaction in favor of his proscribed, banished, persecuted rival. Photius, it is said, from his monastic retreat, administered such skilful flattery to the Emperor, that by Basil's command he was reinstated in the See of Constantinople. So write his enemies. It is more likely that his transcendent learning and accomplishments,² a strong feeling that his crimes had been exaggerated by his implacable adversaries, some lurking jealousy that Constantinople had too completely subjected herself to Rome, may have led to his second rise. A new council, at which were A.D. 879. present two Papal legates, ratified the eleva-

¹ Even Ignatius had maintained against Rome his right to jurisdiction over the Bulgarians. He was in his turn threatened with canonical censures. — Hadrian, *Epist. ad Imperat.*, Labbe.

² Among the most bitter and pathetic lamentations of Photius in his exile is the being deprived of his books.

tion of Photius. The Pope himself, John VIII. (Nicolas and his successor, Hadrian II., had disappeared from the scene), acquiesced in the decision.

The Pope acknowledged the usurper, the monster of wickedness, the persecutor, the heretic, him who had dared to assert the co-equality, the supremacy of Constantinople to Rome, as the legitimate Patriarch.¹

Photius fell again at the death of his new patron. Leo the Philosopher, the son of Basil, once more ignominiously expelled him from his throne. Yet, though accused of treason, Photius was acquitted, and withdrew into honored retirement. He did not live to witness or profit by another revolution. Though the schism of thirty years, properly speaking, expired in A.D. 886.

his person, and again a kind of approximation to Rome took place, yet the links were broken which united the two churches. The articles of difference, from which neither would depart, had been defined and hardened into rigid dogmas. During the dark times of the Papacy which followed the disruption, even the intercourse became more and more precarious. The Popes of the next century were too busy in defending their territories or their lives to regard the affairs of the East. The darkness which gathered round both churches shrouded them from each other's sight.

Nicolas the Great had not lived to triumph even in

¹ Photius is accused of interpolating letters of Pope Leo, certainly much amplified in the Greek translations from the Latin copies, as they now exist, and there are suspicious passages, highly adulatory of Photius, and one suppression (Epist. 97). There are others so much stronger in the Greek that we cannot attribute them to so adroit a writer as Photius. Baronius supposes this *feminine* weakness of John VIII. to have given rise to the fable of Pope Joan! Was an act of peace and conciliation the monstrous and painful travail which revealed her sex?

the first fall of Photius. In the West his success was more complete; he had the full enjoyment of conscious power exercised in a righteous cause. Not merely did he behold one of Charlemagne's successors prostrate at his feet, obliged to abandon to papal censure and to degradation even his high ecclesiastical partisans, but in succession the greatest prelates of the West, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, and even Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, who seemed to rule despotically over the Church and kingdom of France, were forced to bow before his vigorous supremacy.

John, Archbishop of Ravenna, is accused of immoderate ambition and avarice, of determined hostility, and a deep, deliberate design of emancipating his see from the domination of Rome. He had taken possession of certain estates claimed by the Roman see, deposed, excommunicated, imprisoned of his own authority all who made resistance, usurped in favor of St. Apollinaris, the tutelar saint of Ravenna, the privileges of St. Peter; treated the citations of the Pope to appear before his tribunal, or before a synod at Rome, to answer for certain heretical opinions charged against him, with the utmost contempt; though excommunicated by that synod, he persisted in the same disdainful contumacy.¹ He aspired, no doubt, to set up the jurisdiction of Ravenna, which he extended beyond its usual limits, as independent, if not superior to Rome. Unless as having been the imperial residence, the seat of empire, it is impossible to understand on what grounds the archbishop rested his haughty

¹ "Missos illius spernebat, et gloriam beati Petri Apostoli, quantum in se erat, evacuabat." — Anastas. Vit. Nicol. I.

pretensions. Ecclesiastical must, according to his theory, have humbly followed the civil supremacy.

But John was a man of harsh and unpopular character. At first, indeed, he was successful in his appeal to the Emperor Lothair for his interposition. Accompanied by two imperial officers he arrived at Rome. But Nicolas mildly rebuked the ambassadors of the Emperor for presuming to enter into such relations with an excommunicated person; they abandoned his defence. The archbishop, refusing to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, retired from Rome. But his own city did not espouse his cause.¹ At the invitation of the principal inhabitants the Pope visited Ravenna; he was received with the warmest welcome by the nobles, and with the acclamations of the people. John fled to Pavior again to implore the succor of the Emperor. As he passed along the streets the doors were closed, and the citizens shrank from the followers of the excommunicated prelate as from infected persons. From the Emperor himself he received this contemptuous message, — “Let him go and humble himself before that great Pope to whom we and the whole Church submit in obedience.” The proud prelate had no alternative but with tears to implore the mercy of his adversary: and Nicolas, having completed his humiliation by enforcing a public oath of allegiance, and of the most full and loyal obedience, on the most sacred reliques, on the cross and sandals of Christ, and on the four Gospels, condescended to receive him Nov. 1, 862. into communion. The terms of his reconciliation were such as to ensure the complete submission of the See of

¹ Agnelli, Vit. Pontific. Ravenn. apud Muratori. John was accused of tyranny over his suffragan bishops. They were not allowed “limina Apostolorum adire.”

Ravenna. The archbishop was to present himself, unless prevented by illness or unavoidable necessity, once a year at Rome; to consecrate no bishop but after his election by the Duke, the clergy, and the people, and on the sanction, by letter, of the apostolic see; to allow all his bishops free access for appeal to Rome; to surrender all contested property to which he could not establish his claim in the courts of law. So ended this opposition to the papal supremacy in Italy.¹

If power and wealth could have secured independence, the extraordinary rise of the sacerdotal order throughout the Transalpine Carlovingian Empire, more especially of the great metropolitan prelates in France and on the Rhine, during the decline of that dynasty, might have been formidable to the Roman supremacy, if asserted by a timid or a feeble Pontiff. It was not the Pope alone, but all the clergy, who were a permanent undying corporation, as compared with the temporal nobility. The hierarchy had risen, and were still rising, in proportion to the decay,

Transalpine
hierarchy.

¹ "Ut nullus amodo et deinceps Archiepiscopus Ravennæ ad vestra Episcopia sine voluntate vestrâ accedere temptet vel aliquam pecuniam a vobis exigere . . . vel res ecclesiæ vestræ, aut monasteria vestra, sive prædia, per quodvis ingenium diripere audeat." The metropolitan power of Ravenna was annulled. The estates of Ravenna in Sicily seem to have been seized and appropriated by Rome.—Agnelli, p. 103. Yet the ambition of the Archbishops of Ravenna was not extinguished by this discomfiture and spoliation. At the famous battle of Fontanet appeared George, Archbishop of Ravenna, with 300 horses loaded with treasures taken, to the indignation of the clergy, from the churches. George had been consecrated at Rome, but aspired to assert the independence of Ravenna. This wealth was to purchase the Emperor Lothair's favor at this critical juncture. But he chose the wrong side. He was taken, robbed of his treasures, stripped of all to a sorry nag, on which he was led before the conqueror, Charles the Bald. By Charles he was bitterly reproached for deserting his flock and appearing in the front of the battle. He was pardoned by the merciful intervention of the Empress Judith, and resumed his see.—Agnelli, p. 185.

and partly out of the ruins of the great temporal feudalities. That military aristocracy was exhausting itself with unexampled rapidity ; it disclaimed to recruit itself from the lower orders ; and every family which became extinct weakened the power of the temporal nobles. The civil wars, the wars against the Normans, not now confined to the coasts, but ravaging the inland provinces (they had sacked Paris, Ghent, Hamburg, Cologne) ; the libertinism of manners, which crowded the halls of the nobles with spurious descendants, often without perpetuating the legitimate descent ; devotion, which threw many who might have kept up the noblest families into the Church or the cloister ; the alienation of their estates, through piety or superstition, to sacred uses ; — all these causes conspired to drain away the riches and the power of the nobility.

But the perpetual Church was always ready to acquire, and forbidden to alienate, and was protected, even in these wild times, at least in ^{its perpetuity.} comparative security, by awful maledictions against believers, by miracles which seemed constantly at their command, against heathens as well as Christians. Its immortal order rested on no precarious or hereditary descent. The cathedral or the monastery might be burned, as was sometimes the case in the Norman inroads, the clergy and the monks massacred. A new generation arose immediately among the ruins, resumed their wasted estates, and repaired their shattered buildings. The metropolitan or the bishop had always an heir at hand : the transmission of his sacred property, though sometimes diverted from its proper use by hierarchical prodigality or by Episcopal nepotism, descended on the whole in the right line. All these losses

were more than recompensed by unchecked and unscrupulous acquisitions. The Church at times was plundered: all possessions were precarious during the long anarchy which followed the death of Louis the Pious; the persons of the priesthood were not secure. But still it renewed its strength, recovered its dilapidated resources; found some latent power which brought it back to its commanding superiority. It ever retrieved its losses, revenged itself for its humiliations, and still grew on under every, it might seem, fatal change in the political atmosphere.

France and part of Germany, but especially France, had become a kind of feudal theocracy. Ecclesiastical councils almost superseded the Diets of the nation.¹ Bishops and abbots, themselves nobly born, outnumbered the temporal nobles. The descendants of Charlemagne were surrounded by a tonsured, not an armed aristocracy; the greater part of the royal army was levied by the prelates of the Church. Even the royal family, ambitious of real power, were constantly intruding themselves into the more wealthy bishoprics or abba-cies.

The superiority of the clergy even over the Crown Power. was openly and distinctly asserted. Kings were not exempt from that general obedience enjoined by the Apostle.² The clergy ruled the laity through

¹ Nithard says, on occasion of the alliance of Charles and Louis against Lothair, "*Primum quidem visum est, ut rem ad Episcopos sacerdotesque quorum aderat pars maxima, conferret, ut illorum consultu, veluti numine divino, harum rerum exordium atque auctoritas proderetur.*"—l. iv. c. i These were purely secular matters, and this is the usual language. Compare c. iv.

² Hincmar (*De Divortio Hl. et Theut.*), who not only asserted but exercised also this power, quotes, as a sentence of Pope Gelasius, that the pontifical is higher than the royal power, because the clergy have to render an

their vices, but chiefly vices of one kind. They were the appointed, the heaven-delegated guardians of conjugal morals; to them belonged all matrimonial causes; no one, not the highest in the realm, was exempt from their interference. And if their judgments had always been superior to unworthy influences, and if, in these lawless times, they had equally opposed, as some no doubt did, oppression, inhumanity, injustice, their rule might have mitigated far more the ferocious manners, and assisted in blending together the hostile orders and races. But instead of Christianizing the world, themselves had become secularized. They were stern barons or haughty dukes, rather than peaceful prelates and humble teachers of the gospel. It might, indeed, seem that, at this time, the only important public affairs were the domestic relations of the Sovereign. That license which Charlemagne indulged without check or remonstrance, was denied to his feeble descendants. Council after council met on questions of adultery, divorce, and incest. Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, had married successively Ethelwolf, ^{Matrimonial causes.} King of England; Ethelbald, her step-son (a connection which shocked all feeling); and Baldwin, Count of Flanders, who had carried her off and married her with her own consent.¹ Here prudence somewhat checked the moral zeal of the Church. The Pope intercedes in favor of Baldwin, lest he should revolt to the Pagan Normans. Another council, that of Toul, was called to annul the marriage of Stephen, Count of

account even of kings to God. He cites the restoration of Louis the Pious as an act of Episcopal authority. "*Nostrâ ætate Hludovicum Augustum a regno dejectum, post satisfactionem, episcopalis unanimitas, sanioris concilio, cum populi consensu, et ecclesiæ et regno restituit.*" — p. 473.

¹ Nicol. Pap. Epist. Carolo Calvo. 862, Nov. 23.

Auvergne, with the daughter of Raimond, Count of Toulouse, because a relation of his wife's had been his mistress. The Pope himself took cognizance, in a council at Rome, of the divorce of Ingeltruda from her husband, Count Boso, by whom she had been abandoned.

The matrimonial cause, however, which for many years distracted part of France, on which council after council met, and on which the great prelates of Lorraine came into direct collision with the Pope, and were reduced to complete and unpitied humiliation under his authority, was that of King Lothair and his Queen, Theutberga.

This nobility, at once of race and order, which was the strength of the Carlovingian hierarchy, of King Lothair and Theutberga. nobility by birth, and of power by ecclesiastical dignity, was that which was most likely to grow up into natural independence, to resist all foreign supremacy, and, unless met with an intrepid and firm assertion of delegated divine authority, to shake off all subordination. In the struggle with Pope Nicolas the Frank clergy espoused a bad cause, one in which the moral, as well as religious sympathies of mankind were against them. When, in the character of guardians of public and private virtue, they countenanced gross immorality, the abrogation of their unjust decrees by the Pope carried with it the general sentiment. The whole affair is a monstrous tissue of indecency, cruelty, and injustice. To know the times must be known this trial, which so long occupied the clergy of the West.

Lothair II., King of Lorraine, the second son of the Emperor Lothair, had married Theutberga, the daughter of Boso, the powerful Count of Burgundy. Soon after his marriage he had dismissed her, from disinclina-

tion or a former attachment, from his court. The popular feeling had compelled him to restore her A.D. 890. to her conjugal honors; but he would not bear the yoke. Publicly before the officers and great vassals of his court, he accused her of incest with her brother, Hubert, Abbot of St. Maurice.¹ This revolting charge was made more loathsome by minute circumstances, contradictory and impossible.² Yet on this charge the obsequious nobility, with the consent of the clergy, put the unhappy queen upon her trial. She demanded the ordeal of hot water;³ her champion passed through unhurt; and who should presume now to doubt her innocence? She was restored at least to her rank and to outward respect, but treated with such petty and harassing cruelty, that at length the weary woman made a public confession of her impossible crime. A synod of the clergy was convoked at Aix-la-Chapelle; it was attended by the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves; the Bishops of Metz, Tongres, Verdun, Melun, and Autun. Their first decree not only released, but inter- Divorce.dicted Lothair from all connection with his adulterous

¹ Compare throughout, if thought fit, the treatise of Hincmar, *De Divortio Hlotharii et Theutbergæ*. The questions submitted to the archbishop are only surpassed in their offensiveness by their absurdity. Hincmar discusses them with minute obscenity, protesting that he and his fellow bishops are entirely ignorant of such matters, and only acquired their knowledge by reading.

² Not from the high character of the Abbot, whose discipline at St. Maurice was of the loosest; he lived himself with dancing girls. His brother-in-law made him a duke.—*Epist. Benedict III.*, 857. He seems to have lived as a layman.

³ In Hincmar there is a curious discussion on the ordeal. The archbishop draws a strange mystical analogy with the Deluge, in which the wicked were destroyed by water, the just saved: the fire in which Sodom was destroyed, Lot escaped. The ordeal was held to be a kind of baptism. The wiser Archbishop, Agobard of Lyons, wrote against the ordeal, as against some other superstitions of his time.

wife; the second enforced a public penance on the unhappy Theutberga.

But separation alone was not the object of Lothair. He had lived in open concubinage with Waldrada, it has been said, without sufficient proof, the sister of Gunther, Archbishop of Cologne, and niece of Theotgand, Archbishop of Treves.¹ A third council assembled at A. D. 862. Aix-la-Chapelle. At this council, too, appeared the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, Adventinus of Metz, Franko of Tongres, Atto of Verdun, Arnulf of Toul, the Bishops of Utrecht and Strasburg. The king pleaded preëngagement to Waldrada, and declared that he only married the daughter of Boso because her father's alliance was absolutely necessary in the perilous state of the kingdom. The canon laws against incest were read, the confession of Theutberga recited,² the marriage declared void, and Waldrada proclaimed the lawful queen. She appeared in public in all the array and splendor of the king's wife.³

¹ Sismondi quotes as authority for this relationship the *Annales Metenses*, "according to which," he says, "Gunther and Theotgand were excommunicated and deposed on account of their relationship to Waldrada, and the assistance they gave her." In the *Ann. Met.* Gunther is bribed to the king's party by a promise to marry his niece (*neptis*), and this niece cannot be Waldrada. — "Guntharii Episcopi neptis ad regem accersitur, *ac semel*, ut aiunt, ab eo stupratur, atque cum cachinno omnium et omnium derisione ad avunculum remittitur." This insult, moreover, to Gunther is utterly irreconcilable with his faithful adhesion to the cause of Lothair and Waldrada, and makes the affair more inexplicable. — *Ann. Met.* apud Bouquet, p. 191. The *Annales Bertiniani* say that the king was bound to Waldrada by witchcraft, as it was said "*faventibus illi avunculo suo Luitprando et Vultaria, qui ob hoc maximè illi erant familiares.*" Liutprand here seems to have been her uncle. — Apud Bouquet, p. 79.

² A new contradiction was now inserted into the confession of Theutberga, that she was not "*idonea conjux.*"

³ According to one letter of Pope Nicolas, she was actually married "*publico festoque nuptiarum ritu celebrato, Waldradam sibi jure matrimonii sociavit.*" — Nicol. Pap. Epist., Bouquet, p. 434.

It was at this juncture that the Pope interposed to protect the injured and blameless wife of Lothair. Theutberga herself, worn out with persecution, had renewed her confession, and only entreated permission to retire into a convent to bewail her sins. The first negotiations of the Pope were strangely baffled. His legates, one of them the same Radoaldus, Bishop of Porto, who had shown so much weakness or venality at Constantinople, was bribed by Lothair and the Lotharingian bishops. A third council at Metz, at which the Pope's legates were present, ratified Nov. A.D. 862. all the decrees of the former synods. The legates, if they did not assent, made no opposition. With this decree the two Archbishops, Gunther and Theotgand, were so imprudent as to proceed in person, as the king's ambassadors, to Rome. They rushed blindly Archbishops of Cologne and Treves at Rome. Oct. 863. into the net; the net closed around them. Nicolas summoned a synod, and from that synod issued a lofty edict, addressed to Hincmar of Rheims and Wanilo of Rouen. The Pope condemned, in the strongest terms, the guilt of King Lothair — if king he might be called — and Gunther and Theotgand, as the abettors and accomplices in his guilt. He annulled the acts of the synod of Metz, which was hereafter to be called no synod, but a brothel of adulterers. He excommunicated and deposed Gunther and Theotgand, and all the bishops their partisans.

The pride of the high-born prelate, Gunther, broke out into fury at this unexpected affront. He hastened to the camp of the Emperor, Louis the Elder, brother of King Lothair, to whom, on the severance of the empire of Lothair I., had fallen the kingdom of Italy, with the Imperial title. The Emperor at once espoused

the cause of the German prelate, shared in his resentment, and marched with his army upon Rome.

The Pope attempted no resistance; he summoned his clergy around him; ordered a rigid fast and perpetual litanies to God, to avert the wrath of the Emperor. The lawless soldiery entered Rome; the Emperor's guards occupied the approaches to St. Peter's; and as the clergy and people came in solemn procession, with their crosses borne before them, and chanting their sad litanies, the crosses and banners were thrown down, trampled on, and broken; the clergy, maltreated, beaten, hardly escaped with their lives. Even the great crucifix, the offering, it was believed, of the Empress Helena, which contained a portion of the true cross, was broken to pieces, and dashed into the mire. Some pious Englishmen collected the fragments with reverential care. The Pope heard that measures were in agitation to seize his person. He hastily crossed the Tiber in a boat, found his way into the church of St. Peter, and passed two days and nights without food. Heaven, in the mean time, appeared to declare in favor of the defenceless Pontiff. The man who had broken the great cross suddenly fell dead. The Emperor was seized with a fever. In the agony of his terror he sent the Empress to implore the mercy of the Pope. A female ambassador, under such circumstances, was not likely to be difficult as to the terms of reconciliation. Louis at once abandoned the cause of the bishops. Deserted by all, they retired in disgrace to France. There they still supposed themselves secure in their own power, and in the support of King Lothair. Before they left Rome they published an appeal to all Christian bishops. They complained, in the

The Emperor
Louis in
Rome.

March, 864.

language of defiance, of the insolent injustice of the Pope. He had decoyed them to Rome; he had closed the gates on them as on robbers, ignominiously arrested them,¹ condemned them without synod or canonical examination, without accuser, without witness, without discussion, without proof, without their own confession, in the absence of other metropolitan or suffragan bishops, with no common consent, of his own will. Declaration of archbishops. In his tyrannical madness. "This Lord Nicolas, who calls himself Pope, accounts himself as one of the Apostles, and makes himself Emperor, has presumed, at the instigation of our enemies, to condemn us. He will find that we are determined to resist his insanity, and make him repent of his precipitancy." They cast back his anathema in disdain, and in their turn excommunicate the Pope,² and declare that, by his arrogant self-exaltation over the whole Church, he has sequestered himself from its communion.³ They added further, that they asserted only the rights of their own order. Nicolas refused to receive this protest, upon which one of the archbishop's officers and some of his men forced their way into the church of St. Peter, beat down the guards, one of whom was killed, and laid the daring document upon the tomb believed to contain the body of St. Peter.

The archbishops retreated to their dioceses. Notwithstanding the Papal interdict, Gunther celebrated

¹ They describe their arrest: "Ibique obseratis ostiis, conspiratione more latrocinâ facta, et ex clericis et laicis turba collecta et permixta, nos opprimere inter tantos violententer studuisti . . . tuo solius arbitrio ex tyrannico furore damnare nosmet voluisti."

² See this remarkable document in the *Annales Bertiniani*, A.D. 863.

³ "Contenti totius ecclesiæ communione et paternâ societate, quam tu arroganter te superexultans despicias, teque ab eâ elationis tumore indignum faciens sequestras."

divine service in his cathedral at Cologne; the more timid Theotgand abstained from his ecclesiastical functions.

But Lothair was as dastardly as lustful. Other bishops got round him, and urged on his weak mind all the terrors of the Papal power.¹ He did not scruple to sacrifice those prelates who, in compliance with his will, had hesitated at no injustice, and had dared to confront and to defy, to commit a kind of capital treason against the sacerdotal power. He deposed Gunther, and appointed his own son,² a youth only. Gunther was deserted on all sides; the simple and blameless Archbishop of Treves³ had bowed before the storm; the other bishops of the condemned synod of Metz hastened to make their peace with Rome; they gladly accepted the indulgence of the holy father. The Archbishop of Cologne was forbidden to approach the royal presence, avoided as a person excommunicate. He seized the treasure of his Church, and, armed with this, in all ages a powerful weapon, he hastened to Rome to unfold the iniquities of the king's proceedings against his wife.⁴ But Lothair had anticipated his revenge. He sent a bishop with the humblest protestations of repentance and submission to the Apostolic See. The Abbot Hubert, in the mean time, had

¹ This is the language of Nicolas to King Lothair: "Ita corporis tui cedere motibus consensisti, ut relaxatis voluptatum habenis temet ipsum in lacum miserie et in lutum fœcis pro libitu dejecisti, ut qui positus fœras ad gubernationem populorum, effectus sis ruina multorum." — Ad Lothair, Reg., Oct. 863.

² Hugo never obtained actual possession. Some time after the see was intrusted to the care of Hilduin, brother of Gunther, who dispersed the revenues, though the see was held to be vacant. — Ann. Bertin., i. 92.

³ "Simplicissimus ac innocentissimus vir." — Annal. Bertin.

⁴ "Falsa de more suo." — Ann. Bertin., p. 86.

been killed by his own retainers. Theutberga, who had lived under the guardianship of her brother, took refuge in the dominions of Charles the Bald. The alarm of Lothair increased; he suspected his uncles, Charles and Louis, of a design to seize and share his kingdom, the Pope of connivance, if not of more than connivance, in their hostile plans.

Nicolas was not content with his triumph over the feeble Lothair, and the daring but indiscreet bishops who had espoused his cause. He aspired to dictate to the other more powerful Carlovingian kings, to Charles and to Louis; and even Hincmar, ^{Hincmar of Rheims.} the Archbishop of Rheims, the most learned, political, and powerful ecclesiastic in France,¹ must bow before his authority. He sent his legate, Arsenius, into France with letters to the sovereigns so haughty and imperious as to shock even the submissive spirit of those times.² He rebukes them with the tone of a master, or rather openly declares that he speaks with the authority of God, from actual divine inspiration, when he reproaches them for presuming to prohibit the bishops of their realms from obeying the papal summons to a synod at Rome.³ He will not admit the excuse of Charles the Bald that the greater part of the bishops were watching

¹ Sismondi states boldly that Hincmar was the sole ruler of France.

² "Nicolaus Papa Arsenium . . . cum epistolis ad Ludovicum et Carolum fratres . . . non cum Apostolicâ mansuetudine, et solitâ honorabilitate sicut Episcopi Romani consueverant Reges in suis epistolis honorare, sed cum malitiosâ interminatione." — Pagi (sub ann. 865) rebukes the author of the Ann. Bertin., even Hincmar himself, perhaps the author, whose sentiments at all events the book expresses, for this misrepresentation. He appeals to the more courteous letter to Charles. But the epistle to the two brothers fully bears out the charge. April 22, 865.

³ "Unde si vos fortasse aliter dicitis, nos illud dicimus, quod divinitus revelatur." He thus claims divine authority for Roman synods: "Nos consensu illorum, revelante Domino, quæ decernenda sunt decerneremus."

day and night against the descents of the Norman pirates. He reproves this secular occupation of the bishops. If towards these kings he preserves some show of respect, of Lothair he speaks with unmitigated contempt. His uncles had urged Lothair to go on a suppliant pilgrimage to Rome; Lothair had expressed his earnest desire to do so. The Pope sternly interdicts his journey, declaring that the holy Roman Church would not receive, but despise, and reject, such men.¹ He commands the king, without subterfuge or evasion, to receive back his wife; even if Theutberga should prefer the state of separation, she is to be compelled to return to her husband's bed. "But if Lothair, whom, to prevent war and bloodshed, we have still treated with some leniency, shall lift up his horn, and disobey your admonitions and ours, the affair must take its course."

The letter of the Pope to the bishops advances still higher pretensions; the object, indeed, is noble and Christian. He commands them to maintain that peace which had been sworn by the three royal brethren, to prevent the shedding of Christian blood. But he asserts the coronation of the Emperor to be a grant of the Imperial power by the Roman See. The sword was given to the Emperor by the Vicar of St. Peter, yet to be employed against infidels, not against his fellow Christians. The empire descended to Louis by hereditary right, but was confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See.²

¹ "Cui interdiximus, et omnino interdicimus, ut iter talis qualis nunc est non arripiat, eo quod sancta Ecclesia Romana tales respuat et contemnat."

² "Macherae usum, quam primum a Petri principis Apostolorum vicario, contra infideles accepit, non cogatur in Christi fideles convertere. . . . Regna sibi per hæreditarium jus devoluta, et sedis Apostolicæ auctoritate firmata." — Epist. ad Episcop. Gall. apud Bouquet, p. 404.

The legate "from the side" of the Pope began now to appear as a dictator to the Northern kings. Arsenius was not the first who bore this title ; ^{Papal legates.} but he asserted its pride and power with yet almost unprecedented vigor. The legate first appeared at Frankfort, and delivered his message to the Emperor Louis ; thence he passed to the court of Lothair.¹ He threatened the king with immediate excommunication if he did not dismiss the concubine Waldrada, and receive his repudiated queen. He then betook himself to Attigny, the residence of Charles the Bald. He peremptorily commanded the restoration of the Bishop Rothrad, who had been canonically, as it was asserted, deposed by Hincmar his metropolitan, and was now irregularly, without inquiry or examination, replaced by the arbitrary mandate of the Pope.² Hincmar murmured and obeyed ; the king acquiesced in the papal de- ^{A.D. 865.} cree, trembling at the menaced anathema.

From Attigny, Arsenius conducted Theutberga to the court of her husband. A solemn oath ^{Arsenius crowns Lothair and Theutberga.} was dictated by the legate, and sworn on the Gospels by six counts and six vassals, in the name of Lothair, that he would receive Theutberga as his lawful wife, and restore her fully to her ^{A.D. 865.} conjugal rights. Four archbishops and four bishops besides the legate, were present at the ceremony. She was then publicly delivered to her husband, under the most awful denunciations of excommunication and con-

¹ "Apud Gandulfi villam." — Ann. Bertin.

² The Annales Bertin. are supposed to express the sentiments of Hincmar. "Et Rothradum canonice a quinque provincialium episcopis dejectum, et a Nicolao papâ non regulariter, sed potentialiter restitutum." — P 29.

demnation to everlasting fire,¹ if he did not fulfil the solemn compact. Lothair and Theutberga were then crowned king and queen of Lorraine.

Arsenius found the papal fulminations weapons too useful and effective to be confined to royal offenders. A terrible excommunication of unusual violence was launched against certain plunderers who, some years before, had robbed him of a large sum of money, unless they made immediate restitution. Another was issued against Ingeltruda, the wife of Count Boso, who had left her husband, and was leading a wandering and disreputable life.²

Waldrada had been delivered up to Arsenius to be conducted to Rome that she might undergo the proper penance; but Arsenius was persuaded by some powerful influence, not impossibly by bribery (for he was a man of notorious rapacity), to allow her, after she had reached Parma, to return to France.³ Two years afterwards the two excommunicated archbishops, beguiled with false hopes of restoration, were persuaded to go to Rome; though on a former journey they had been sternly repelled by the Pope. The aged archbishop of Treves died there; Gunther of Cologne hardly escaped with his life. Nicolas persisted to the

¹ "Si in omnibus, ut superius legitur, non observaverit atque impleverit, non solum in præsentē vitâ sed etiam in æterno Dei terribili judicio, eum B. Petro principi Apostolorum redditurum rationem et ab ipso æternaliter in eodem judicio damnandum, et igni perpetuo concremandum." — Ann. Bertin., p. 90.

² The Ann. Bertin. mention this: "Epistolam Nicolai Papæ plenam terribilibus et a modestiâ sedis Apostolicæ hactenus inauditis maledictionibus."

³ Nicolas wrote to the bishops to treat Waldrada as an excommunicated person, for her contumacy in refusing to go to Rome, and her suspicious intrigues against the queen. — Epist. xxviii., Bouquet, 419.

end in his resistance to the intercession of the emperor Louis, and of many German bishops. He treated these men as open favorers of adultery; as the authors and contrivers of all this foul and revolting iniquity.¹ The inexorable Pope saw one die, the other on the brink of the grave, without relaxing his unforgiving severity.

Rumors soon reached the vigilant Pontiff that the reconciliation of Lothair with his wife was but false and seeming. He was suspected of continuing secret intercourse with Waldrada; although Adventius, the Bishop of Metz, protested that all the king's conversation with Waldrada (Waldrada, now under public sentence of excommunication)² was pure,³ and that he treated his wife with the utmost respect, that he appeared with her in church, and was reported to admit her to his bed.⁴ But this was soon belied by an earnest supplication to the Pope from the unhappy queen to be released from her miserable marriage. She asserted the previous wedlock of Lothair with Waldrada, her own unfitness, from some secret malady, for the conjugal state. She entreated to be permitted to come to Rome, that she might communicate with the Pope. Nicolas replied in a tone of stern commiseration. He refused to receive a confession extorted manifestly by force. Even were

¹ Compare his later letters, where he speaks of the "fœtida gesta." His usual name for Waldrada is *mœcha*.

² Waldrada was excommunicated Feb. 2, 866.

³ Thus writes Adventius: "Et nos veriore experientiâ investigare volumus, in nullo prorsus colloquio per tactum, vel visum illâ (Waldradâ) fieri voluit."

⁴ "Theutbergam Reginam noster Senior ad præsens ita tractare cernitur, sicut rex conjunctam sibi debet tractare reginam, videlicet ad divinum officium pariter honorificè comitantem, et in mensâ regiâ simul convivantem, atque, ut relatio innuit, conjugalibus habitibus debitum solvere hilaritè prætendit." — Apud Rouquet, p. 595.

she to die, the Church would never permit Lothair to marry the adulteress Waldrada. The guilty king, by the example of his adultery, had plunged thousands into the chaos of perdition ; what wonder if she should force others to commit perjury ? He positively forbade her journey to Rome, and exhorted her to endure glorious martyrdom in the cause of righteousness.

Oct. 30, 867 The wretched Theutberga was, in the mean time, exposed to every insult and contumely. Lothair had at one time accused her of adultery, and proposed that she should vindicate her honor by wager of battle.

Jan. 867. Nicolas prohibited this appeal to arms ; and in a letter to Lothair himself, contempt, most profound and well deserved, mingles with his indignant expostulations. Lothair was at length driven, by the steadfast severity of the Pope, from every subterfuge. He was preparing to send his wife to Rome, to appear himself before the judgment-seat, and even to yield up his beloved Waldrada to the penitential discipline of the Church. Before his descent into Italy he endeavored, by the intercession of his uncle, the Emperor Louis, to obtain for his son by Waldrada the promise of Alsace. For this end he still lingered in France ; but Nicolas did

Death of
Nicolas I.

Nov. A.D. 867. in November, A.D. 867 — a Pontiff who, if he advanced no absolutely unexampled pretensions to supremacy in behalf of the Roman See, yet, by the favorable juncture and auspicious circumstances which he seized to assert and maintain that authority, did more

His charac-
ter.

than all his predecessors to strengthen and confirm it. During all his conflicts in the West with the royal and with the episcopal power, the moral and religious sympathies of mankind could not

but be on his side. If his language was occasionally more violent, even contemptuous, than became the moderation which, up to this time, had mitigated the papal decrees, he might plead lofty and righteous indignation: if he interfered with domestic relations, it was in defence of the innocent and defenceless, and in vindication of the sanctity of marriage: if he treated kings with scorn, it was because they had become contemptible for their weakness or their vices: if he interfered with episcopal or metropolitan jurisdiction, the inferior clergy, even bishops, would be pleased to have a remote, and possibly disinterested tribunal, to which they might appeal from prelates, chosen only from aristocratic connections, barbarians in occupation and in ferocity:¹ if he was inexorable to transgressors, it was to those of the highest order, prelates who had lent themselves to injustice and iniquity, and had defied his power: if he annulled councils, those councils had already been condemned for their injustice, had deserved the reproachful appellation with which they were branded by the Pope, with all who had any innate or unpervverted sentiment of justice and purity. Hence the presumptuous usurpation even of divine power, so long as it was thus beneficently used, awed, confounded all, and offended few. Men took no alarm at the arrogance which befriended them against the oppressor and the tyrant.

The impression left by Nicolas I. on his times may be estimated by the words of a later writer. "Since the days of Gregory I. to our time sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicolas. He

¹ Giraud, *Droit Romain en France pendant le Moyen Age* vol. i.

tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign: to holy bishops and clergy he was mild and gentle; to the wicked and unconverted a terror; so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him.”¹

But this vast moral advancement of the popedom was not all which the Roman See owes to Nicolas I.; she owes the questionable boon of the recognition of the False Decretals as the law of the Church.

Nicolas I. not only saw during his pontificate the famous False Decretals take their place in the jurisprudence of Latin Christendom; if he did not promulgate, he assumed them as authentic documents; he gave them the weight of the papal sanction; and with their aid prostrated at his feet the one great Transalpine prelate who could still maintain the independence of the Teutonic Church, Hincmar Archbishop of Rheims.

Up to this period the Decretals, the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome, according to the authorized or common collection of Dionysius, commenced with Pope Siricius, towards the close of the fourth century. To the collection of Dionysius was added that of the authentic councils, which bore the name of Isidore of Seville. On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest Popes from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the councils from Silvester to Gregory II., thirty-nine false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic coun-

¹ *Regin. Chron. ad ann. 698. Pertz, i. 579.*

cils.¹ In this vast manual of sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world. contents.

The False Decretals do not merely assert the supremacy of the Popes — the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome — they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity, and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross, the discovery of the reliques of the Apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The

¹ Nicolas of Cusa, and Turrecremata, before the Reformation, had doubted, as far as they dared to doubt. The Magdeburg centuriators, after them Blondel exposed the fraud with unanswerable arguments. The Jesuit, La Torre, attempted a feeble defence: he was scourged into obscurity by Blondel. Since that time there has been hardly a murmur of defence. There is an excellent brief (Roman Catholic) summary of the whole question in Walter (*Kirchen Recht*, pp. 155 et seq.). Mohler (*Schriften*) softens the fiction into poetry: he is too ingenious to be convincing; and wishes to convince, rather than succeeds, as it appears to me, in convincing himself. I know only from other writers what seems the masterly investigation of Knust. Gröner, in his *History of the Church* and in a dissertation (*Freiburg*, 1848), displays more than his usual industry and sagacity, but I think is somewhat too narrow and partial (compare Walter, *Kirchen Recht*, 158) in his hypothesis, that the sole, if not the sole, the almost exclusive design of the Decretals was to lower the power of the metropolitans. Indeed, in his later and valuable work, *Die Karolinger* (*Freiburg*, 1848), he seems to me to have taken a wider range, to have summed up the whole question with more perfect mastery. Gröner's general failing, in my judgment, is drawing wide and peremptory conclusions from scanty and doubtful evidence: he is too much enamoured of his own very great ingenuity.

whole is composed with an air of profound piety and reverence; a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandizement of the See of Rome and the aggrandizement of the whole clergy in subordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men — the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable; — the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favor; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day, and throughout the later history of Christianity.

The author or authors of this most audacious and *Authorship.* elaborate of pious frauds are unknown; the date and place of its compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The False Decretals came not from Rome;¹ the time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain. In one year Nicolas I. is apparently ignorant of their existence, the next he speaks of them with full knowledge. They contain words manifestly used at the Council of Paris, A.D. 829,

¹ Eichhorn, almost alone, maintains their Roman origin. — Compare also Luden. *Geschichte*, v. p. 468, *et seqq.*

consequently are of later date; they were known to the Levite Benedict of Metz,¹ who composed a supplement to the collection of capitularies by Adgesil, between A.D. 840-847. The city of Metz is designated with nearly equal certainty as the place in which, if not actually composed, they were first promulgated as the canon law of Christendom.

The state of affairs in the divided and distracted empire might seem almost to call for, almost to justify, this desperate effort to strengthen the ecclesiastical power. All the lower clergy, including some of the bishops, were groaning, just at this time, under heavy oppression. By the constitution of Charlemagne, which survived under Louis the Pious, and, so long as the empire maintained its unity, asserted the independence of the Transalpine hierarchy of all but the temporal sovereign, the clergy were under strict subordination to the bishop, the bishop to the metropolitan, the metropolitan only to the Emperor. Conflicting Popes, or Popes in conflict with Italian enemies, or with their own subjects, had reduced the papacy to vassalage under the empire. Conflicting kings, on the division of the realm of Charlemagne, had not yet, but were soon about to submit the empire to the Roman supremacy. All at present was anarchy. The Germans and the French were drawing asunder into separate rival nations; the sons of Louis were waging an endless, implacable strife. Almost every year, less than every decade of years, beheld a new partition of the empire; kingdoms rose and fell, took new boundaries, acknowledged new sover-

¹ Walter appears to think Benedict the author of the work.

eigns ; no government was strong enough to maintain the law ; might was the only law.¹

The hierarchy, if not the whole clergy, had taken the lead in the disruption of the unity of the empire ; they had abased the throne of Louis ; they were for a short disastrous period now the victims of that abasement. Their wealth was their danger. They had become secular princes, they had become nobles, they had become vast landed proprietors. But during the civil wars it was not the persuasive voice, but the strong arm, which had authority ; the mitre must bow before the helmet, the crosier before the sword. Not only the domains, the persons of the clergy had lost their sanctity. The persecution and oppression of the Church and the clergy had reached a height unknown in former times. Thus writes Bishop Agobard of Lyons : “ No condition of men, whether free or unfree, is so insecure in the possession of his property as the priest ; no one can foresee how many days he may be master of his church, of his house. Not only the estates of the Church, the churches themselves are sold.” The Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 836) protested against the contempt into which the clergy had fallen with the ungodly laity. They wrote in bitter remonstrance to King Pepin, the son of Louis, — “ There are people who boldly say, ‘ Where hath God ordained that the goods of which the priests claim possession are consecrated to him ? The whole earth is the Lord’s ; has he not created it for the good of all mankind ? ’ ”² The metropolitans alone

¹ This is in no way inconsistent with the immense and steady advance of the clergy in power and wealth ; it was a temporary depression, remedied as will soon appear, from other sources of vigor and energy.

² Mansi sub ann. 836.

(we have seen those of the Rhine haughty to all beneath them, basely subservient to the wickedness of their kings) stood above the tumult, themselves if not tyrants or instruments of royal tyranny, either trampling on the inferior clergy, or, at least, not protecting them from being trampled on or plundered by others.

It might occur to the most religious, that for the sake of religion; it might occur to those to whom the dignity and interest of the sacerdotal order were their religion, that some effort must be made to reinvest the clergy in their imperilled sanctity. There must be some appeal against this secular, this ecclesiastical tyranny: and whither should appeal be? It could not be to the Scriptures, to the Gospel. It must be to ancient and venerable tradition, to the unrepealed, irrevocable law of the Church; to remote and awful Rome. Rome must be proclaimed in an unusual, more emphatic manner, the eternal, immemorial court of appeal. The tradition must not rest on the comparatively recent names of Leo the Great, of Innocent the Great, of Siricius, or the right of appeal depend on the decree of the Council of Sardica. It must come down from the successors of St. Peter himself in unbroken succession. The whole clergy must have a perpetual, indefeasible sanctity of the same antiquity.

So may the idea of this, to us it seems, monstrous fiction have dawned upon its author; himself may have implicitly believed that he asserted no prerogative for Rome which Rome herself had not claimed, which he did not think to be her right. It is even now asserted, perhaps can hardly be disproved, that the False Decretals advanced no pretensions in favor of the See of Rome which had not been heard before in some vague and

indefinite, but not therefore less significant, language. The boldness of the act was in the new authority in which it arrayed these pretensions. The author may have thought that in renewing the power, while he by no means lost sight of the holiness of the clergy, he was embarked in a hallowed cause. In some respects he shows skill at least as consummate as might be expected in that age. There was no great fear of detection in a fiction so advantageous to those who could alone expose it, the clergy, in an age which, for instance, received the life of St. Denys, written by the Abbot Hilduin of that monastery, and the ecclesiastical counsellor of the emperor, as identified with Dionysius the Areopagite; a legend almost of unparalleled extravagance, but which became at once accredited hagiology. The new code was enshrined, as it were, in a framework of deeply religious thought and language; it was introduced under the venerated name of Isidore of Seville (it was rumored to have been brought from Spain by Riculf, Archbishop of Metz); it was thus attached to the authentic work of Isidore, which had long enjoyed undisputed authority. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, as the most powerful, so, perhaps, the most learned Transalpine ecclesiastic, who might at once have exposed the fiction, which he could hardly but know to be a fiction, coöperated more than any one else to establish its authority. So long as he supposed it to advance or confirm his own power, he suppressed all intrusive doubts; he discovered too late that it was a trap (a mousetrap is his own undignified word) to catch unwary metropolitans.¹ Hincmar was caught, beyond all hope of es-

¹ "Circumposita omnibus metropolitans muscipula." — Opp. ii. 413.

cape. In the appeal of Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, against Hincmar, metropolitan of Rheims, Pope Nicolas I. at first alleges no word of the new Decretals in favor of his right of appeal; he seemingly knows no older authority than that of Innocent, Leo, Siricius, and the Council of Sardica.¹ The next year not merely is he fully master of the pseudo-Isidorian documents, but he taunts Hincmar with now calling in question, when it makes against him, authority which he was ready to acknowledge in confirmation of his own power. Hincmar is forced to the humiliation of submission. Rothrad, deposed by Hincmar, deposed by the Council of Senlis, is reinstated in his see.²

This immediate, if somewhat cautious, adoption of the fiction, unquestionably not the forgery, by Pope Nicolas, appears to me less capable of ^{Adoption at Rome.} charitable palliation than the original invention. It was, in truth, a strong temptation. But in Rome, where such documents had never been heard of, it is difficult to imagine by what arguments a man, not unlearned, could convince himself, or believe that he could convince himself, of their authenticity. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, of which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent: yet is there no holy indignation at fraud, no lofty reproof of those who dared to seat themselves in the pontifical chair and speak in

¹ Compare back p. 52.

² This fact appears to me irresistibly proved by Grörrer in his dissertation. See also *Die Karolinger*, i. p. 479 et sequ. Grörrer seems to infer that they were carried to Rome from beyond the Alps by Rothrad of Soissons.

the names of Pope after Pope. There is a deliberate, artful vindication of their authority. Reasons are alleged from which it is impossible to suppose that Nicolas himself believed their validity, on account of their acknowledged absence from the Roman archives. Nor did the successors of Nicolas betray any greater scruple in strengthening themselves by this welcome, and therefore only, unsuspecting aid. It is impossible to deny that, at least by citing without reserve or hesitation, the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud.¹

Nor must be overlooked, perhaps the more important result of the acceptance of the pseudo-Isidorian statutes as the universal, immemorial, irrevocable law of Christendom. It established the great principle which Nicolas I. had before announced, of the sole legislative power of the Pope.² Every one of these papal epistles was a canon of the Church; every future bull therefore rested on the same irrefragable authority, commanded the same implicit obedience. The Papacy became a legislative as well as an administrative authority. Infallibility was the next inevitable step, if infallibility was not already in the power asserted to have been bestowed by the Lord on St. Peter, by St. Peter handed down in unbroken descent, and in a plenitude which could not be restricted or limited, to the latest of his successors.

¹ Nicolai Epist. ad Episcopos Galliae, Mansi, xv. 693.

² Nicolai I. Epist. ad Michaellem Imperatorem, apud Labbe, sub ann. 865

CHAPTER V.

HADRIAN II. HINCMAR OF RHEIMS.

NICOLAS was succeeded by Hadrian II., a rigid and lofty churchman, who, though his policy at first appeared doubtful,¹ resolutely maintained, Hadrian II. Nov. 867. but not with equal judgment and success, the principles of his predecessor. Hadrian (he was now seventy-five years old) had been married before he became a priest; his wife was still living; and a tragic event, in which the son of another prelate, Arsenius, the late legate in France, was involved, might suggest to the popular mind that the more absolutely the higher clergy were secluded from all domestic ties the better.

Though the daughter of Hadrian was betrothed to another, she was carried off and married by Eleutherius, the son of Arsenius. Arsenius, implicated no doubt in the affair, fled with all his treasures to the court of the Emperor Louis. These treasures he placed in the hands of the Empress Ingeltruda, probably to secure the imperial protection for his son. He died Death of Arsenius the legate. suddenly, and so great was the hatred against him, that he was said to have been carried off while conversing freely with devils;² at all events, he died

¹ Vit. Hadriani, c. 15.

² "Ut dicebatur, cum dæmonibus confabulans, sine communione abiit in suum locum." — Ann. Bertin. p. 99

without the sacrament, and of his eternal damnation no one had any doubt. Hadrian sent a mission to the Emperor to demand that Eleutherius should be judged by the Roman law for the abduction of his daughter.

Oct. 12,
A.D. 868. Eleutherius in revenge, or despairing of the issue, murdered both his wife and her mother, the wife of the Pope.¹ By the Emperor's command he suffered the penalty of his crimes.

Hadrian, whether softened by these domestic calamities, appeared at first to take a milder course than Pope Nicolas in the affair of Lothair. He sent back, indeed, Theutberga, who had arrived at Rome to implore the dissolution of the marriage on the plea of her own personal infirmity: but, at the intercession of the Emperor Louis, he took off the ban of excommunication from Waldrada, and restored her to the communion of the Church.

By this lenity he might seem to lure King Lothair to the last act of submission. The King of
A.D. 868,
Feb. 12. Lorraine arrived in Italy. The Pope seemed to yield to the influence of Louis and the Empress Engelberga; at least he accepted the munificent presents of the king.

From Monte Casino, where they first met, Lothair followed the Pope to Rome. There, instead
Lothair at
Rome.
A.D. 869.
July 1-11. of being received as a king, and as one reconciled with the See of Rome, when he entered the church all was silent and vacant; not one

¹ Hincmari Ann. "Stephaniam uxorem ipsius pontificis et ejus filiam, quam sibi rapuit, interfecit." Anastasius the Librarian (not the biographer of the popes), the brother of Arsenius, was concerned, as was supposed, in this horrible business. The excommunication, already issued against him, was confirmed and repeated by Hadrian.

of the clergy appeared: he retired to a neighboring chamber, which was not even swept for his reception. The next day was Sunday, and he hoped to hear the mass chanted before him. The Pope refused him this honor. He dined, however, the next day with the Pope, and an interchange of presents took place.¹

At length Hadrian consented to admit him to the communion. Towards the close of the holy office, holding the body and blood of Christ in his hands, the Pope thus addressed the king: "If thou avouchest thyself innocent of the crime of adultery, for which thou hast been excommunicated by the Lord Nicolas, and art resolved never again to have unlawful intercourse with the harlot Waldrada, draw near in faith, and receive this sacrament for the remission of thy sins. But if thou thinkest in thy heart to return to wallow in adultery, beware of receiving it, lest thou provoke the terrible judgment of God." The king shuddered, but did not draw back. Under a like adjuration, that they were not consentient to the guilt of the king with Waldrada, he administered the rite to the attendants on Lothair. Even Gunther, the contumacious Archbishop of Cologne, having drained to the dregs the cup of humiliation, was admitted to lay communion.²

What was the terror of Western Christendom when it became known that every one of these men had perished before the end of the year! A pestilence, so common among northern armies in Italy, especially at Rome, broke out. But a few, and those only, it is said, who had avoided that fatal communion, survived.

¹ The Ann. Bertin. and Ann. Met. do not quite agree in the arrangement of these events. This scene is placed by the former at Monte Cassino, sub ann. 869.

² This is the most probable time for the reconciliation of Gunther.

Aug. 8. Lothair himself was seized with the fever at Lucca, with difficulty reached Placentia, and there expired.

Pope Hadrian seized the occasion of the contest for the kingdom of Lothair to advance still more daring and unprecedented pretensions. But the world was not yet ripe for this broad and naked assertion of secular power by the Pope, his claim to interfere in the disposal of kingdoms. Directly he left the strong ground of moral and religious authority, from which his predecessor Nicolas had commanded the world, he encountered insurmountable resistance. With all that remained of just and generous sympathy on their side Popes might intermeddle in the domestic relations of kings; they were not permitted as yet to touch the question of royal succession or inheritance. The royal and the episcopal power had quailed before Nicolas; the fulminations of Hadrian were treated with contempt or indifference: and Hincmar of Rheims in this quarrel with Hadrian regained that independence and ascendancy which had been obscured by his temporary submission to Nicolas.

Charles the Bald his uncle, the son of Louis the Pious and the Empress Judith, seized at once the vacant dominions of Lothair, though the undoubted inheritance of the Emperor Louis II., as brother to the childless deceased sovereign. Charles was crowned at Metz; he rested his claim on the election of the people, and on his coronation by the bishops of the realm.¹ The friendship of Louis the Emperor and King of Italy, then engaged in a success

Hadrian interferes in the disposal of Lothair's kingdom.
It is seized by Charles the Bald. June 28, 870.

¹ Hadriani Epist. ad Ludovic. German. apud Bouquet, p. 442.

ful war against the Saracens of Bari, was of greater importance to the Pope than that of Charles, now gathering almost the whole of the Transalpine empire under his sway. He espoused the claims of Louis with headlong ardor. The Emperor, he wrote significantly to the elder uncle Louis the Germanic, was warring, not like some other kings, against Christians, but against the sons of Belial, the enemies of the Christian faith; and he warned Louis against aggression on dominions which were not his own. "The hand of the Apostolic See will be strong on the side of this most pious Emperor; and the great Dispenser of battles, through the intercession of the chief of the apostles, will insure triumph."¹

In a letter to the nobles of the kingdom of Lorraine, he threatened with excommunication all who, June 28, 870. disregarding the mandates of the Apostolic Hadrian re- See, should oppose the claims of his ally the Emperor. To the nobles of Charles's kingdom he declared, that any one who should assist in his diabolic usurpation, would fall under anathema, and be given up to the companionship of the devil. He summoned the bishops, on their allegiance to the Apostolic See, to dissuade Charles from his ambitious designs. By concurring in such detestable deeds they were preparing him for hell.² To Charles himself he wrote two letters; one before the invasion, reprehending him for refusing to receive the papal legates; the second after it, threatening him with interdict, and accusing him of perjury for violating, as he said, the treaty of Verdun.

¹ See the account of this campaign, and one for the imprisonment of the Emperor by the Duke of Benevento, in Erchempert, c. 34, 35; Pertz, iii. 252.

² "Et illi tam detestabilia faciendo . . . gehennam paratis." — Hadrian. *ad Episcop. Gall. Ibid.*

Hincmar had been specially summoned to break off all communion with the king, if he did not abandon the cause of Charles. Hincmar's answer shows that the doctrine of Wala, as to the inviolability of ecclesiastical fiefs, was not respected by such kings: "Should I do so, I should soon have to chant by myself in my choir, stripped of all my possessions and vassals."¹

But the king, the nobles, and the bishops pursued their course — the king of ambition, the rest of obsequious obedience — without regarding the denunciations of Hadrian. Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, threw his preponderating weight into the scale in favor of the independence and consolidation of France and its absolute severance from the kingdom of Italy, which now seemed associated with the Empire. He wrote a grave, solemn, and argumentative remonstrance to the Pope. He refused to withdraw, as commanded by Hadrian, from the court of Charles. He embodied in his own language that of Charles and his partisans.² "You," said the King and nobles to the bishops, "contribute your prayers only against the Normans and other invaders; if you would have the support of our army as we of your prayers, demand of the Apostolic father that, as he cannot be both king and bishop, and as his predecessors ruled the Church, which is their own, not the state, which is the king's, he impose not on us a distant king, who cannot defend us against the sudden and frequent attacks of the pagans, nor command us Franks to be slaves. His ancestors laid not their yoke on our ancestors, nor will we bear

¹ "Quoniam, si ex sententiâ vestrâ agerem, ad altare meæ ecclesiæ cantare possem, de rebus autem et facultatibus et hominibus nullam amplius haberem potestatem." — Hincm. Oper. ii. 697.

² Hincmar, Oper. ii. p. 689.

it, for it is written in the Scriptures, that we should fight for our liberty and our inheritance to the death." ¹ The only enemy or rival whom Charles feared was his brother, Louis the Germanic; but a share in the spoil averted his enmity. Notwithstanding the interdict of the Pope, and the claims of the Emperor, the Kings of France and Germany quietly divided the dominions of their nephew. This strife was hardly over when Hadrian interposed in another affair, relating to the family of Charles the Bald; in revenge, it might be, for the contempt of his former mandates. Now he asserted his supremacy even over parental authority, though recognized and confirmed by the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the realm. It is a lawless and cruel history, showing at once the barbarous state of the times, the ambition and inhumanity too prevalent even among the clergy.

Carloman was the fourth and youngest son of Charles the Bald. The Church had already become a provision for the younger sons of kings, who, besides this, supposed that they were propitiating Heaven by the consecration of some of their family to the service of God. Charles the Bald made two such offerings. Lothair, who was lame, was forced to become a monk, and as Abbot of Moutier St. Jean and of St. Germain d'Auxerre, maintained the decency of his station till his death. But Carloman was less suited for the cloister. Though Abbot of St. Médard, in Soissons, he was permitted to indulge his warlike inclinations in a campaign against the Normans, with Solomon, A.D. 866.

King of Brittany. Carloman gained no great glory in this expedition, but imbibed a passion for a restless and adventurous life, unbecoming a monk. Yet abbacies

¹ P. 695.

were heaped upon him;¹ when suddenly he was arrested on a charge of conspiring against his father, stripped of all his benefices, and thrown into prison at Senlis. During the same year he was released from prison; but immediately fled into the Belgic country, raised a band of desperate robbers, and committed frightful ravages over the whole district. The king had no forces at hand to repress these outrages; he had recourse to the bishops, who, as Carloman had received deacon's orders, were urged to interpose their authority. The bandit's companions were excommunicated, and condemned, if they should be taken, to death. Carloman himself, having deceived his father by the promise of surrender, appeared again at the head of his robbers in Lorraine, ravaged the country around Toul, and crossed the mountains (the Vosges) into Burgundy. The bishops were preparing to take the extreme measure of degradation against the apostate ecclesiastic and unnatural son. To their amazement, Carloman having made a secret appeal to the Pope, letters from Hadrian July 13, 871. appeared, espousing the cause of the robber and rebel in terms of unprecedented vehemence. Resentment for the disobedience of Charles, in the seizure of Lothair's dominions, was almost the avowed cause of this extraordinary step. "Not only, O king, hast thou usurped the realm of others, but, surpassing the wild beasts in cruelty, thou hast not in thy rage respected thine own entrails, thy son Carloman. Like the ostrich, as we read in the holy book of Job, thou hast hardened thine heart to thy son, as though he were not thy son. Thou hast not only deprived him of his father's favor, and of all his benefices, but thou hast

¹ "Plurimorum monasteriorum pater reputatus." — Ann. Bertin.

banished him from thy kingdom, and, what is more impious, endeavored to procure his excommunication. But Carloman has appealed to the Apostolic See, and by the Apostolic authority we command thee to refrain from thy cruelty, and exhort thee, not, contrary to the apostle's admonition, to provoke thy children to wrath. Restore him then to thy favor; receive him as thy son with parental affection; reinstate him in his honors and his benefices, at least, till our legates arrive, who, by their authority, with due respect to the honor of both, may dispose and order all things. Heap not sin on sin; forswear thy usurpations, and thy avarice; and showing how thou hast profited by correction, seek with thy whole heart the pardon of the Church; strive to the end lest thou perish everlastingly. The term of thy crimes will be that of our rebuke, and by God's assistance thou wilt reach the end of thy guilt and thy punishment."

Hadrian at the same time addressed the nobles of France and Lorraine to forbid them to take up arms against Carloman; and the bishops, prohibiting his excommunication. But the clergy of France made common cause with the king, above all Hincmar of Rheims, himself involved in inevitable strife with the Pope. If the king had a rebellious son and subject, supported by the Pope, Hincmar had a contumacious nephew and suffragan, who appealed to the Pope and defied the authority of his uncle and metropolitan. How far common interests had led to any secret understanding between these two rebels against the royal and archiepiscopal authority is not clear; but Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, alone of the Frankish clergy, refused to subscribe to the act of degradation against

Hincmar
of Laon.

Carloman. Hincmar of Laon must be made to pass rapidly over the scene. This turbulent nephew of Archbishop Hincmar, who bore the same name, had been advanced by misjudging nepotism in early youth to the See of Laon.¹ His first acts were acts of rebellion and contumacy against the metropolitan authority of his uncle. He had come into collision on an affair of property with the temporal power, and given offence to King Charles the Bald. He was summoned before a secular tribunal, deprived of a rich abbey: even the revenues of his see were sequestered. The nepotism of the elder Hincmar woke again, and entered into alliance with his lofty Churchmanship. He rebuked the unhallowed conduct of the king, who had presumed to lay his profane hands on a bishop, and to adjudge property claimed by the Church. He quoted against the king the irrefragable authority of passages from the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.² Hincmar of Laon, after an apology not too humble, was reinstated in his abbey and in the possession of his see.

In the same year came another outbreak of turbulence from Hincmar of Laon, the forcible seizure of a New charges against Hincmar of Laon. fief to which he laid claim and the expulsion of Nortman, a noble, by his armed men. The king took up his noble's cause; the Bishop was forced to take refuge before the altar of his church. From thence he actually laid his whole diocese under an interdict: no rite of religion was to be performed in the closed and silent churches. The elder Hincmar put forth his metropolitan power, and annulled the in-

¹ Hincmar bitterly reproaches his nephew: "*¶*Idelicet quia statim ut a paternæ nido educationis factus Episcopus evolasti." — p. 598.

² Passages from the letters of Popes Lucius and Stephanus. The document, pp. 316, 333. — Hincmar, Op. ii. p. 323.

terdict.¹ The clergy, aghast, know not whom to obey, for Hincmar of Laon had appealed to Rome: in Rome he had probably long kept up secret intelligence. He turned his own theologic weapons against his uncle; with passages from the false Decretals he limited and defied the metropolitan power. The quarrel becomes more fierce and obstinate. Council after council meet, at Pistes (866), at Gondeville (868), at Attigny; they meet in vain. Hincmar of Rheims labors in prolix writings to assert the plenitude of metropolitan authority; he has found out that the new Decretals are not so absolutely above doubt, yet he dares not boldly to deny their authenticity. Hincmar of Laon asserts the unqualified supremacy of the Pope: Hincmar of Rheims asserts that the statutes of councils are of higher authority than the decrees of Popes; the Pope's Decretals owe their power to the authority of councils. Hincmar of Laon displays firmness worthy of a better cause: the bishops declare against him, and pronounce the interdict unlawful: the king accuses him of a breach of his oath of allegiance. He appeals to Rome; he exhibits letters of Pope Hadrian, summoning him to Rome. Already the Pope had entered into the con-
Interference
of Pope
Hadrian.
March 25, 871.
test; he had commanded the excommunication, without hearing or inquiry, of Nortman, the claimant and possessor of the disputed fief; he had reproved both the king and the archbishop for daring to forbid the Bishop of Laon to leave the realm and go to Rome. Hincmar of Laon fled to his city of Laon.

Hincmar of Rheims now, in the name of the king,

¹ The charges of Hincmar of Rheims against Hincmar of Laon contain 55 capitula, or charges, occupying above 200 folio pages in his works, from 377 to 593.

addressed an expostulation to Pope Hadrian; it was strong at once, and not undignified: "You have compelled me by your indecent letters, alike disparaging to the royal authority and unbecoming Apostolic moderation, and filled with outrage and insult, to reply in no very friendly tone. It is time that you should know that, although subject to human passions, I am a man, framed in the image of God, holding through the grace of God the royal dignity by descent from my ancestors; and, what is far greater, a Christian, an orthodox Catholic Christian, instructed from my youth in sacred and profane laws and letters.¹ You have neither legally nor regularly accused me of any public crime before the bishops, still less convicted me. Yet you have dared to call me a perjurer, a tyrant, a traitor, an usurper of the estates of the Church."² He afterwards asserts that the Kings of France are not the Vicegerents of the bishops, but the lords of the realm; and appeals to former precedents that none of his royal ancestors had been addressed in such terms by the predecessors of the Pope. This letter, however, takes no notice of the most flagrant invasion of the royal rights, the unjustifiable interference of the Pope in favor of the rebel Carloman, which must have been still pending, or at least not de-

¹ On the literary cultivation of Charles the Bald, compare Sir F. Palgrave's *Hist. of Normandy and England*, p. 273, and note, p. 729.

² The close of the letter is the most remarkable part. Throughout Hincmar appeals only to the ancient accredited decretals of Leo, Celestine, Gelasius, and to the African Councils. He closes with these words: "We are not ignorant that whatever is written from the Apostolic See according to the sacred Scriptures, the preaching of the ancients, and the authority of councils, is to be held and obeyed: whatever beyond that has been compiled or forged is not only to be rejected but refuted also." "*Quod sicut a quoquam fuerit compilatum sive confictum non solum respuendum sed et redarguendum esse cognovimus.*" — vol. ii. p. 716.

terminated; it dwells entirely on the affair of Hincmar, Bishop of Laon. This affair, being a revolt, as it were, against the Metropolitan power of the Archbishop of Rheims, seems put forward by that prelate, as though the crime of his own kinsman and the rebellion against spiritual authority were the more heinous offence.

Hadrian had doubtless the sagacity to perceive his error. The correspondence between the king and the Pope became on both sides more amicable.¹ Carloman was abandoned, and to a tragic fate.² Unable to withstand the power levied against him by his A.D. 871. father, he again surrendered, was again imprisoned at Senlis. Two years afterwards he was brought to trial before the bishops, and degraded from his clerical orders. His partisans, however, and Carloman, no doubt, himself, rather rejoiced in this degradation, which opened again the path of secular ambition. He might aspire, if not to the throne, to a share in the dominions of his father. The bishops had, perhaps, by this time perceived that this division of the royal dominions at the death of each successive monarch was the inherent weakness of the crown, and, dreading a contest for the throne in the distracted state of the kingdom, attacked on every side by the pagan Normans, determined to secure the peace of the Church and kingdom. Carloman was again put upon his trial, and condemned to

¹ "Quasi tumores et lesiones vestras palpare sensimus, has oleo consolationis per dulcissimum melos caritatis, et sanctæ dilectionis unguentum fovere, lenire, et ad sanitatem perducere optamus." — Hadrian. Epist. ad Car. Carlv., Labbe, p. 937.

² See the Acts of the Synod of Doucy, Labbe, p. 1539, 1844. He was accused by the king as a perjured traitor and disturber of the public peace; by Hincmar, as contumacious against his metropolitan. Hincmar reserved to the Pope only the right of appeal given by the Council of Sardica. — Compare Planck, iii. p. 183.

death. This punishment was commuted for one more barbarous. His eyes were put out, and he was shut up in the Abbey of Corbey. His partisans contrived to carry him off, and conveyed him to the court of Louis of Germany, who named him Abbot of Esternach. He did not long survive his cruel treatment.

If the king triumphed over his rebellious son, so did Hincmar of Rheims over his rebellious nephew. Nor was the Archbishop's nephew more mercifully treated than the King's son. Hincmar of Laon suffered the same fate; he too was condemned, and suffered the loss of his eyes like Carloman. The two rebels against royal and metropolitan authority were thus joined in the same barbarous punishment. Both these events, however, took place after the death of Hadrian, during the rule of his successor. The death of Hadrian may have emboldened the clergy of France to take the affair into their own hands, and so to achieve their full victory.

Nicolas I. and Hadrian II. thus, with different success, imperiously dictating to sovereigns, ruling or attempting to rule the higher clergy in foreign countries with a despotic sway, mingling in the political revolutions of Europe, awarding crowns, and adjudging kingly inheritances, might seem the immediate ancestors of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., of Boniface VIII. But the papacy had to undergo a period of gloom and degradation, even of guilt, before it emerged again to its height of power.

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN VIII. THE SARACENS. THE DUKES OF LOWER ITALY

THE pontificate of John VIII. is the turning point in this gradual, but rapid and almost total, A.D. 872. change; among its causes were the extinction of the imperial branch of the Carlovingian race, and the frequent transference of the empire from one line of sovereigns to another; with the growth of the formidable dukes and counts in Italy, which overshadowed the papal power, and reduced the Pope himself to the slave or the victim of one of the contending factions. The Pope was elected, deposed, imprisoned, murdered. In the wild turbulence of the times not merely the reverence but the sanctity of his character disappeared. He sank to the common level of mortals; and the head of Christendom was as fierce and licentious as the petty princes who surrounded him, out of whose stock he sprang, and whose habits he did not break off when raised to the papal throne.

John VIII., however, still stood on the vantage ground occupied by Nicolas I. and Hadrian II. He was a Roman by birth. He signalized his pontificate by an act even more imposing than those of his predecessors, the nomination to the empire, which his language represented rather as a grant from the papal

authority than as an hereditary dignity ; it was a direct gift from heaven, conveyed at the will of the Pope. Already there appear indications of a French and German interest contending for the papal influence, which grows into more and more decided faction, till the Carolingian empire is united, soon to be dissolved for ever, in the person of Charles the Fat. John VIII. Aug. 876. adopted the dangerous policy of a partial adherence to France. The Emperor Louis, the son of Lothair, had died without male issue. Charles the Bald was never wanting in boldness and activity to advance his claims, just or unjust, to an increase of dominion. He marched hastily into Italy ; his nobles crowded to his standard. Of the two sons of Louis of Germany the elder attempted in vain to arrest, or was bribed to permit, his passage of the Alps. The Pope hastened to bestow the imperial crown on Charles. Dec. 17, 875. An Emperor with a title so questionable was not disposed to be scrupulous as to the author of the gift. " We have elected," writes John VIII., " and approved, with the consent of our brothers the other bishops, of the ministers of the holy Roman Church, and of the senate and people of Rome, the King Charles, Emperor of the West." In his letters to the bishops and counts of Bavaria, whom he forbids to espouse the cause of their king in the assertion of his rightful title to the empire, or to invade the territories of Charles, the Pope describes the march of Charles as almost miraculous, and intimates throughout that he was invited by the Church, in which resided the divine power of bestowing the empire.¹ No later Pope held more unmeasured language — " How do we discharge

¹ " *Sibi divinitus . . . collatum.*" — Epist. cccxvii.

our functions as vicegerents of Christ in his Church if we do not strive for Christ against the insolence of princes?"¹ He speaks of "our son Louis, Ed. 876. your glorious king, if he be a son who has always been disobedient to our holy predecessors, if glorious who has waged unhallowed wars against Christians; '*bella gerens nullos habitura triumphos*;' if a king, who cannot govern himself."² The Bavarian bishops are threatened with instant excommunication if they refuse to concur with the legates of John in preventing the war by mild or by threatening means. Another letter to the bishops who adhered to the title of Louis is still more violent; he treats them as Iscariots, as followers of the fratricide Cain. "They murmur not against Charles, but against God, the giver of crowns."³ But the historians are almost unanimous as to the price which Charles was compelled to pay for his imperial crown. He bought the Pope, he bought the senators of Rome; he bought, if we might venture to take the words to the letter, St. Peter himself.⁴

The imperial reign of Charles the Bald was short and inglorious. His brother and rival, Louis A.D. 876. of Germany, died during the next year, but left his kingdoms and his title to the Empire to his three sons. War broke out; Charles suffered a disgraceful defeat

¹ "Ubi est quæsumus, quod vicem Christi in ecclesiâ fungimur, si pro Christo contra insolentiam principum. . . ."—*Apud Labbe, sub ann.* The whole letter is remarkable.

² *Epist. cccxviii.*

³ "Neque enim contra Carolum est murmur vestrum, sed contra Dominum ejus est regnum, et cui voluerit ipse dabo illud."—*Ibid.*

⁴ *Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 876.* "Beato Petro multa et pretiosa munera offerens in Imperatorem unctus et coronatus est. . . Imperatoris nomen a prasule sedis Apostolicæ Johanne, ingenti pretio emerat." *Ann. Met. 877.* "Omnem senatum populi Romani, more Jugurthino corrumpit, sibi que socavit."—*Ann. Fulden.*

on the Rhine by Louis of Saxony. After his second descent into Italy, where Pope John met him at Pavia, he was in danger of being cut off in his retreat by the Oct. 6, 877. forces of Carloman, King of Bavaria. He died on the road, in a small hamlet in the Alps. As his physician was a Jew, it was generally believed that he was poisoned; though the Jews educated in the Arabian universities of Spain, were no doubt more advanced in medical science than any others in Europe.

John VIII., even before the death of Charles the Bald, might repent of having yielded to the Danger from the Saracens. temptation of bestowing the imperial crown on an obsequious but remote sovereign, who could so ill discharge his office of Protector of the Roman See. But where could he have looked for a more powerful protector against the formidable enemies which were environing the capital of Christendom on every side, the Saracens, and the no less dangerous Christian petty princes of Italy? The whole pontificate of John VIII. was a long, if at times interrupted, agony of apprehension lest Rome should fall into the hands of the unbeliever. The reign of the late Emperor Louis had been almost a continual warfare against the Mohammedans, who had now obtained a firm footing in Southern Italy. He had successfully repelled their progress, but at the death of Louis Rome was again in danger of becoming a Mohammedan city. The Pope wrote letter after letter in the most urgent and feeling language to Charles the Bald soon after he had invested him with the empire.¹ "If all the trees in the forest," such is the style of the Pope, "were turned into tongues, they could not describe the ravages of these impious pagans."

¹ Ad Carol. Calv. Imper. apud Bouquet, p. 471.

the devout people of God is destroyed by a continual slaughter: he who escapes the fire and the sword is carried as a captive into exile. Cities, castles, and villages are utterly wasted, and without an inhabitant. The bishops are wandering about in beggary, or fly to Rome as the only place of refuge." The well-known story, whether false or true, by the belief which it obtained, shows the deadly hatred between the Christians and the Moslem, and the horrors of the war. Salerno was besieged by the Saracens (this was at an earlier period, about the accession of John VIII.): the gallant defence of the city by Count Guaifer probably retarded at that time their career of conquest. The Saracen general, or king as he is called, is said to have violated a number of Christian nuns on the altar in the church of St. Fortunatus. While in this act of cruelty and guilt to one of them he was crushed by a huge beam, which fell or was skilfully detached from the wall. The maiden escaped unhurt.¹ The usual appellation of the Saracens by the Pope is Hagarenes, sons of fornication and wrath. In a passage in a later letter to Count Boso, the Pope describes the Saracens as an army of locusts, turning the whole land into a wilderness: extensive regions were so desolate as to be inhabited only by wild beasts.² The most terrible intelligence of all is that an armament of three hundred ships, fifteen of which carried cavalry, was in preparation to attack and conquer Rome. "Consider," says the Pope, "what a vast and unparalleled³ evil this would be; the loss of that city would be the ruin of the world, the peril of Christianity itself." In another pressing letter to Charles the Bald he says, "All Cam-

¹ Anonym. Salern.² *e. g.* Epist. xxxviii.³ Incomparabile!

pania is a desert; the Hagarenes have crossed the Tiber, and are wasting the suburban district; they destroy all churches and shrines; massacre the monks and clergy.”¹ Somewhat later he alludes to the starvation of Rome; some of the senate were in danger of perishing with hunger.² All this time, bitterly complains the Pope, the Christians, instead of flying to the relief of the Roman see, were engaged in unnatural wars against each other; wars in which John forgets his own concern.

Yet, if possible, even more formidable than the infidels were the petty Christian princes of Italy. “The canker-worm eats what the locust has left.” These Nov. 16, 876. The nobles in the Roman territory. appear to have been the inferior nobles, the marquises (marchiones) in the neighborhood of Rome. The more powerful princes seized likewise every opportunity of confusion to enrich themselves or to enlarge their dominions. “Those,” writes Pope John to the Emperor, “who are not unknown to you, trample down all our rights in the Roman territory, seize all that the Saracens have spared; so that there is not a single herd of cattle in all our domain, nor a single human being to commiserate or lament the desolation.”³ In many parts of Italy had gradually arisen independent dukedoms; and none of these appear to have felt any religious respect for the Pope, some not for Christianity. They were ready on every occasion to assail and plunder the city itself: for which they were sometimes punished, when the imperial power was strong; more often they defied its impotence.

¹ He entreats the Empress Richildis to influence her husband to protect him; his whole realm is confined within the walls of the city. — Epist. xxx.

² Epist. xlv.

³ Epist. xxx.

A Transalpine Emperor was too distant to maintain awe for any long time. In the South were the old Lombard Dukes of Benevento and Spoleto, the Duke of Naples, who owned a kind of remote fealty to the Eastern Empire, the Princes of Capua, Salerno, and Amalfi. On the vacancy after the death of Pope Nicolas, Lambert of Spoleto had occupied and pillaged Rome,¹ respecting neither monastery nor church, and carrying off a great number of young females of the highest rank.² Adelgis, the Duke of Benevento, had dared to seize in that city the sacred person of the Emperor Louis.³ The Emperor had fled with his wife and a few soldiers to a lofty tower, in which he was besieged, and glad to accept terms of capitulation.⁴ He was only permitted to leave the city after he had taken a solemn oath to Adelgis — an oath in which his wife, his daughter, and all his attendants were compelled to join — that he would neither in his own per-

¹ The cause of this insurrection was the rapacity of the Empress Ingelberga and the cruelty of the French soldiery with her. — Anastas. in Vit. Hadrian.

² At a later period, as appears by a letter of Pope John VIII., the same Lambert had demanded the chief of the Roman nobility to be surrendered to him as hostages. — Ann. Bertin.; Ann. Fuldens. sub ann. 871; Muratori, Ann. d'Italia, *ibid*.

³ Erchempert assigns two reasons why God permitted this humiliation of Louis: because he had insulted Pope Nicolas, and spared two Saracen kings whom he might have put to death as Saul did Agag. — Apud Pertz, p. 253.

⁴ The popular verses current at the time show the profound impression made by this act of treason against the imperial majesty. It is a curious transition specimen of Italo-Latin: —

“Audite omnes fines terræ, horrore cum tristitia,
Quale scelus fuit factum Benevento Civitas,
Lhudovicum comprehenderunt sancto pio Augusto.”

The descent of the Saracens in great force was thought a providential visitation for the crime of the Beneventans.

son nor by any other revenge this act of insolent rebellion. No sooner, however, had Louis reached Ravenna in safety than he sent to the Pope to absolve him from his oath. Hadrian II., then Pope, began to assert that dangerous privilege of absolution from solemn and recorded oaths.¹ The two Lamberts of Spoleto were accused of conniving at, if not consenting to, this daring exploit.

The Duke of Naples, the Greek Emperor's subject, acted altogether as an independent prince. Sergius, who had succeeded his father in the Neapolitan dukedom, was accused of secret and friendly intelligence with the Saracens; of supplying their piratical fleets with provisions, and thus purchasing security for his own dominions by sacrificing the rest of Southern Italy. His uncle, Athanasius, Bishop of Naples (the high families of Italy now, as well as of the Franks, aspired to ecclesiastical dignities), had, at the commencement of his reign, reproved him for this alliance with the Unbeliever. Sergius, once imprisoned, afterwards drove his uncle, the bishop, into exile. After the death of the Emperor Louis, during the reign of Charles the Bald, the Pope, John VIII., was more earnestly desirous of breaking this unhallowed league between the so-called Christian and the Saracen. He tried in vain anathema and excommunication. At length he appeared in person at the head of an army with the two Lamberts, Dukes of Spoleto, who had received orders from the Emperor, Charles the Bald, to assist him.² Guaifer, Prince of Salerno; Palear, Prefect of Amalfi; and Docibilis, Duke of Gaeta, were also on too friendly

¹ Liutprand. — Regino, lib. ii.

² Erchempert. Muratori, *Ann. d'Italia*, A.D. 877.

terms with the Saracens.¹ In a conflict between the two armies, twenty-two Neapolitans were taken and beheaded, as under the papal anathema, with the sanction of the Pope.² A second Athanasius, the brother of Duke Sergius, had succeeded to his uncle as Bishop of Naples. He was a man of lawless and unmeasured ambition, but with specious cunning sacrificed, as it seemed, all the ties of kindred and of blood to the cause of the Pope and of Christianity. He organized a formidable party in Naples, seized and imprisoned his brother the duke, and sent him blinded to Rome, where he died shortly after in misery and disgrace.³ The Bishop then took possession of the vacant dukedom; the civil and ecclesiastical offices met in his person as they had at Capua in the Bishop Landulf. The Pope, John VIII., highly approved of this usurpation, commended Athanasius because he had overthrown the new Holofernes, and had not spared his own flesh and blood. The Pope betrayed his inward triumph that a churchman had thus assumed the secular authority: he wrote to

Athanasius
Bishop Duke
of Naples.
A.D. 875.

¹ By the assistance of Erchempert we trace the rise and progress of this race of lawless, independent princes. The busiest and not least lawless were the Bishops (in general of the ruling family) Landulf of Capua and Athanasius of Naples. Of these, Landulf, one of the four sons of Lando, Prince of Capua, became Bishop of Capua. Erchempert insinuates against him the worst vices — and he hated monks! — P. 251. Yet John consented to his episcopate, “*Pandenulfus Landenulphum germanum suum conjugatum clericum fecit episcopum, mittensque Romanum Johanni Papae episcopum fieri exposcit, a quo et exauditus est.*” — *Ib.* 255. Athanasius is briefly described: “*Episcopus et magister militum.*”

² “*Octavo die anathematis xxii. Neapolites milites apprehensos decollari fecit: sic enim monuerat Papa.*” — Erchempert, 39.

³ The fifth letter of John seems to have been addressed to Athanasius soon after his promotion to the bishopric. He there threatens Sergius with an irrepealable anathema (non dissolvendum). — Labbe, Concil. ix. p. 5. “*Et Romam mittitur suffossis oculis.*” — Erchempert.

the people of Naples confirming the title of Athanasius, and declared that divine inspiration must have guided them in the wise choice of such a ruler.¹

But the bishop-duke did not scruple to return to the unhallowed policy of his brother. He entered into a new league with the Saracens, gave them quarters, and, A. D. 877. actually uniting his troops with theirs, defeated the forces of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno, and opened a free passage for their incursions to the gates of Rome. It was this danger which caused so much alarm to Pope John, and called forth such loud and urgent clamors for aid from the Transalpine powers.² The united troops of the Christian bishop and the Saracens devastated the whole region, plundering convents and churches, desolating "towns, villages, cities, hills, mountains, and islands." Even the famous and holy monasteries of St. Benedict and St. Vincent did not escape.³

All hopes of succor from the Emperor, Charles the Bald, had been frustrated by his retreat from Lombardy, and his death. The Pope, who had gone to meet him at Vercelli, and had held a council at Ravenna, returned only to submit to an ignominious tribute to the Saracens. In vain he launched his anathemas: while they struck with terror remoter parts of Christendom, they

¹ Ad pop. Napolit. Compare also Epist. xlv.

² John hoped to obtain assistance from the Greek Emperor Basil, against his *subject*, as well as against the Saracens. The Greek fleet was in those seas; he begged him to send ten large vessels (achelandra) for the protection of Rome. — Epist. xlv. This is urged to excuse the weakness of John in consenting to the patriarchate of Photius. — See above, page 36.

³ Joan. Epist. lxvi. lxvii. In one of the expeditions of Pandenulfus, one of the princes of Capua, who joined the Neapolitans and Saracens, the monk, the writer of the history of the Lombard princes, was taken, stripped of all he had, and carried away captive.

were treated with contempt by these lawless chieftains.¹

The Imperial crown was again vacant, and claimed by the conflicting houses of France and Germany.² But Carloman, son of Louis of Germany, had been acknowledged as King of Italy. Probably as partisans of the German, and to compel the Pope to abandon the interest of the French line, to which he adhered with unshaken fidelity, Lambert, Duke of Spoleto, that anti-Christ, as the Pope described him,³ with his April 28, 878. adulterous sister, Richildis, and his accomplice, the treacherous Adelbert, Count of Tuscany, at the head of an irresistible force, entered Rome, seized and confined the Pope, and endeavored to starve him into concession, and compelled the clergy and the Romans to take an oath of allegiance to Carloman, as King of Italy. For thirty days the religious services were interrupted; not a single lamp burned on the altars.⁴

No sooner had they retired than the Pope caused all

¹ Epist. xlv. Docibilis, Duke of Gaeta, had surrendered a fortress, on which, it was said, depended the safety of Rome.

² From the battle of Fontanet and the treaty of Verdun took place the final separation between France and Germany. Charles the Bald took his oath in Roman, Louis in German. The Roman and the Teutonic had begun their antagonism.—See Palgrave, p. 66.

³ Epist. lx. There are two letters to Lambert (lxii. and lxiii.), from the latter of which he appears to have treated the Pope with great disrespect, and to have assumed some control over the Legations (Ann. Fulden. sub ann.; see also lxxxii.). The Pope disguises this, and accuses Lambert himself of aspiring to the empire. He had before charged him with a design of permanently occupying the territory of St. Peter and the Holy City; of having sent an embassy to Sorrento to conclude an alliance with the Saracens, and to invite a reinforcement of their troops.—Epist. ad Concil. Trec. xc.

⁴ The clearest description of this is in letters to the Archbishop of Ravenna, to Count Berengarius, the Empress Ingelberga, and to Louis the Stammerer.—lxxxiv. vii

the sacred treasures to be conveyed from St. Peter's to the Lateran, covered the altar of St. Peter with sackcloth, closed the doors, and refused to permit the pilgrims from distant lands to approach the shrine. He then fled to Ostia, and embarked for France.

When he reached the shores of Provence, John VIII. felt himself in another world. Instead of turbulent and lawless enemies (such were the Counts and Dukes of Italy), whose rapacity or animosity paid no respect to sacred things, and treated the Pope like an ordinary mortal, the whole kingdom of France might seem to throw itself humbly at his feet. He was received at Arles by Boso, Duke of Lombardy, May 11, 878. master, likewise shortly to become King of Provence,¹ and whose ambition aspired to the Empire. Boso, after having poisoned his first wife, had married, it was said by force, Ermengard,² the daughter of the Emperor, Louis II. Wherever the Pontiff went he was received with the highest honors. He summoned a council to be held at Troyes. Louis the Stammerer, King of France; the three kings, the sons of Louis of Germany, were cited to appear. Louis alone obeyed the mandate.

No Pope was more prodigal of excommunication than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300, it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten, inflict, or at least allude to this last exercise of sacerdotal power.³ The

¹ On the advancement of Boso to the throne of Provence, see Bouché, *Hist. de Provence*, pp. 738, 769; Palgrave, note 744. The Pope's first act was to erect Arles into a metropolitan see, and to grant the pallium to the Bishop Rostagne; afterwards he appointed him Legate, with full powers. — *Epist. xc. et seqq.*

² Ermengard was the last of the line of Lothair, the eldest son of Louis the Pious. — *Epist. cxvii.*

³ The wiser Nicolas had warned bishops against too frequent use of this

Council of Troyes opened with the recital and confirmation of the papal anathema against Adelbert of Tuscany and Lambert of Spoleto. The anathema was ratified with one voice by the assembled bishops, and commanded to be published in all their churches, and in those of their suffragans. Formosus, Bishop of Porto, the Apostle of the Bulgarians, afterwards Pope, the head, it seems, of the German faction, was involved with all his accomplices in one sentence of excommunication, degraded, and anathematized. The obsequious episcopal senate echoed each anathema with perfect concord. Another broad and sweeping excommunication comprehended all persons who should in any way usurp the property of the Church; they were excluded from the communion of the faithful, and, if they persisted in not making restitution, deprived of Christian burial. The Pope did not scruple, of his own authority and that of the council, to make an addition to the fundamental laws of the Transalpine realm. He found the Teutonic code imperfect, as containing no statute against sacrilege; he caused to be inserted that in the Justinian code, mitigating the fine from five pounds of pure gold to thirty pounds of tried silver. In return for this humble resignation of his authority, John VIII. condescended to crown Louis the Stammerer King Sept. 7, 878. of France; his queen was excluded from that honor, on account of some irregularity in her marriage. He rendered, moreover, to Louis the service of excommunicating some of his enemies, especially Bernhard, Marquis of Languedoc. The execution of this act was confided to another Bernhard, of Provence, who was to be re-

precious weapon: "Non temere ad excommunicationes procedant . . . **ne** auctoritas episcopalis vilescat." — Labbe, viii. 562.

warded out of the confiscation. Nothing was too lofty to defy, nothing too mean to escape, the fulminations of John. He will soon appear anathematizing the three great Archbishops of Italy — of Milan, Ravenna, and Naples: ¹ he launched an excommunication, addressed to all Christians, against some thieves who had stolen his horses, and a silver cup belonging to St. Peter, when John was on his way to Troyes.²

The indefatigable Pope returned over the Alps by the Mont Cenis, to Turin, and Pavia; but of all whom he had so commandingly exhorted, and so earnestly implored to march for his protection against the Saracens, and no doubt against his Italian enemies, none obeyed but Duke Boso of Provence.³ For this extraordinary mark of fidelity the Pope showed extraordinary gratitude; he declared him, as Duke of Lombardy, his adopted son. Since the son of Louis the Stammerer, Carloman, was married to the daughter of Duke Boso, the Pope was thus bound in closer alliance with the house of France. The ambition of Count Boso aspired, after the death of Carloman, King of Italy, to the Empire. The death of Louis the Stammerer, and the intrigues concerning the succession to the throne of France, thwarted in one way the policy of the pontiff; in another, seemed to encourage his ambition, at least to strengthen, rather than mitigate, his animosity to the

¹ Epist. cxxviii., Milan, May 1, 879; cclxxviii., Ravenna; cclxx., Naples.

² Epist. xcvii. In the Council of Troyes, which closed Sept. 878, the episcopal dignity was asserted by a decree that all the public authorities should pay the bishop the respect due to his rank — not sit in his presence till leave was granted; and this assertion was likewise guarded by excommunication. — Labbe, Concil. p. 314.

³ John, Epist. cxix.; Labbe, p. 89.

German Carolingians. He wrote to Charles the Fat,¹ the King of Swabia, hereafter to be Emperor, to warn him, under peril of excommunication, against any invasion on the dominions of Boso, his adopted son.² This was to close the gates of Italy against the Germans, to keep them beyond the Alps. If it had been the policy of John to erect a firm, hereditary kingdom in the north of Italy, in alliance with, and as a protector of the papacy against the Saracen and the lawless southern dukes, his object might, perhaps, justify this usurpation of authority. But his sole design was to obtain a kingdom for his adopted son. He attempted to summon a council at Pavia, as obsequious as that which had met at Troyes.³ In tone, partly of persuasion, partly of menace, he cited Anspert, Archbishop of Milan; Berengar, Duke of Friuli, and the Bishops of Parma, Placentia, Reggio, and Modena. Four times was Anspert summoned, twice at least excommunicated, and threatened with the utmost power of the Roman See.⁴ By this excommunication of Anspert he would establish his despotic authority over the Bishops of Lombardy. But Anspert and the Italian Prelates and Counts paid not the least respect to the papal summons or the papal excommunication: they neither appeared at Pavia, nor, in obedience to a later summons, at Rome.⁵ In Provence the adopted

Excommuni-
cation of
Archbishop
of Milan

¹ Charles the Fat was the eldest of the three sons of Louis the Germanic.

² Epist. cxxi. et seqq.

³ Epist. cxxvi. cxxviii.

⁴ The Pope afterwards invested the Bishop of Pavia, in legatine authority, with full power of excommunication; he interfered in the appointment of Anspert's successor, degraded a bishop consecrated by Anspert, and named another in his place. To the death of Anspert, John considered him under the sentence of excommunication.

⁵ Epist. clxxxi. clxxxii.

son of the Pope met with better success among the clergy. A synod of ecclesiastics met at a place called Montaille, in the territory of Vienne, and assumed the right of founding a new kingdom, of disregarding the rights of the sons of Louis the Stammerer, and of investing Boso with the title of King of Provence and of Arles. The influence of the Pope had no doubt great weight with the Bishops of this Council. Boso is said to have paved the way for his elevation by the promise of wealthy abbeys to be attached, by royal and papal authority, to the Episcopal Sees.¹ The Council consisted of the Archbishops of Vienne and Lyons, of the Tarantaise, and of Aix, with seventeen suffragan Bishops. Of their sole authority, though with some tacit consent of the nobles, compelled by the necessity of providing for the security of their churches, and acting at least with the implied assertion of divine commission,² they elect the King, but do not define the boundaries or extent of his kingdom. In their address they strongly impress on Boso his royal duties, especially regard for the honor of God, the protection of the Catholic faith, the exaltation of the Church. Boso received the gift with profound humility; he acknowledged that he received the crown from their good-will alone, and promised the fullest obedience to God's inspired priests.³ Thus Councils had become Diets or Parliaments, awarded and carved out kingdoms. The nobles of Provence make neither protest nor remonstrance.

¹ Labbe, Concil. Arles signs as Episcopus; but he had already received the pallium from John. — Epist. xcii. et seq.

² "Nostri Dei, per suffragia sanctorum . . . Christo præduce."

³ Apud Labbe, Concil. ix. p. 333.

Pope John in the mean time was compelled to crown the Emperor, Charles the Fat. Charles had marched with a preponderating force into Italy; John had met him at Ravenna, reluctant but obedient.¹ Though Charles was of the German line, the Pope yielded, yet he yielded with haughty condescension. "We have called you by the authority of our letters, for the advantage and exaltation of the Church, to the Imperial Sovereignty." The Pope enjoins him before his arrival in Rome to send some of his chief officers to ratify, in his name, all the privileges of the Roman See. He acknowledges the Emperor's power of making ordinances concerning the territory of St. Peter, which he is bound to protect against the Saracens and evil-minded Christians: "The Church must suffer no diminution, but rather be augmented in her rights and possessions."²

Charles the Fat, crowned Emperor,³ by degrees became master of the whole dominions of Charlemagne. For a few years the Empire of the West displayed its ancient unity. The kingdom of Arles stood alone in precarious independence. But though he received at Rome the Imperial Crown, the Emperor could afford no efficient protection against the Mohammedans. The Pope, who was founding kingdoms beyond the Alps, who was again interfering in the ecclesiastical quarrels of Constantinople, alternately absolving and excommunicating the Patriarch Photius, confirming or annulling the so-called general Council of Constantinople, was

¹ Aug. 879, Hincmar Annal.

² Epist. cccvi. cccvii.

³ Coronation of Charles, Christmas 880, or early in 881. See Muratori, *sub ann.*; Jaffé, Feb., March, 881. The western empire of Charles was properly only from 884 to 887.

trembling within the walls of Rome at the invasion of the Saracens, and in vain heaping interdict on interdict, not merely on the secular princes, but against an ecclesiastic, a more dangerous enemy.

Athanasius, the Duke-Bishop of Naples, still maintained in secret his unholy alliance with the enemies of the Cross.¹ The Pope visited Naples,² in order to persuade him to join the other Dukes in a general defensive league against the common enemy of Christendom. He offered large sums of money, which Athanasius received with unscrupulous avidity, and pledged himself to break off his wicked alliance. But the perfidious Prelate not merely kept up his amicable relations with the Saracens, he punctually received his share of the booty made during their ravages.³ The Pope, in the most solemn manner, pronounced the sentence of excommunication; he declared Athanasius suspended from his office, and cut off from the communion of the Church.⁴ It was not till a year after that Athanasius yielded, or pretended to yield, to the terrors of the sentence. He sent a deacon to Rome to assure the Pope that he had abandoned his infidel allies. But the mistrustful Pope demanded, before he would grant the absolution which he sought, some more convincing evidence of his sincerity. He required that Athanasius should commit himself with his old allies, by an act of signal perfidiousness and cruelty; that he should seize the chief of the Mohammedans, send them to Rome, and massacre the rest in

¹ Athanasius stood by no means alone. See the excommunication of the people of Amalfi for the same cause. — Epist. cccxv. and cccxlii.

² Epist. cclxvii.

³ Epist. cclxvii.

⁴ Epist. cclxxx.

the presence of the Legates. By this *Christian* act, demanded by the head of Christendom, he was to obtain readmission to the Christian Church, and the right to officiate as a Christian Bishop.¹ It is almost impossible to trace the intricate labyrinth of intrigue, treachery, crime, war, which filled the later years of this Duke-Bishop. Nothing was done without an oath; and no oath influenced for a day his policy or his actions. His great object was to make himself master of Capua, an object seemingly attainable through the deadly feuds of the various descendants of the Ducal house, whom Lando, the Bishop, had committed in interminable strife. They, in their revenge, as each party obtained or lost the mastery at each turn, made or degraded a Bishop. The Saracens, in the mean time, courted by all parties, impartially plundered all, made or broke alliances with the same facility with the Christians,² while the poor monks, even of St. Benedict's own foundation, lived in perpetual fear of spoliation. The last days of John VIII. were occupied in writing more and more urgent letters for aid to Charles the Fat, in warfare, or providing means of war against his Saracen and Christian foes, or dealing excommunications on all sides; yet facing with gallant resolution the foes of his person and his power.

This violent Pope is said (but by one writer only)³ to have come to a violent end: his brains Dec. 15, 882.

¹ "Atque si præsentibus his nostris, Marino videlicet reverendissimo episcopo et sanctæ sedis nostræ arcario, et Sicone egregio viro, majores Saracenorum quantos melius potes, quos nominatim quarimus, cum aliis omnibus caperes, et, *aliis omnibus jugulatis*, eos nobis direxeris." — Epist. cxciv. 882.

² "Saraceni invitati ab omnibus, omnia diruunt, omnia consumunt."

³ Ann. Fuldens. Contin.

were beaten out with a mallet by some enemy, covetous of his wealth and ambitious of the papal crown. That he had enemies who would not have scrupled at such a crime, rests on his own acknowledgment, and these were men of high rank and official dignity. In the early years of his pontificate, Gregory the Nomenclator, and George his son-in-law, are accused of having for eight years, that is almost during the whole pontificate of John, committed the most enormous crimes, and aimed at seizing the papacy. The actual crime which called for the terrible sentence of anathema against these men was a conspiracy either to murder the Pope and his faithful adherents,¹ or to introduce the Saracens into the city.² They had been cited to answer this charge; and, after much suspicious delay, had seized a large portion of the treasures of the Church, passed the gate of St. Pancrazia with false keys, and left it open to the marauding Saracens, who might have surprised Rome. It is the most remarkable part of the affair that Formosus, Bishop of Porto, called the Apostle of the Bulgarians, and afterwards Pope, is involved as an accomplice in these dark charges, and named in the same sentence of excommunication. Yet the specific offences urged against Formosus are of a totally different kind — disobedience to the Roman See,

¹ "Summum Romanæ urbis pontificium, conjurantibus sibi dudum suis complicitibus factiose præripere affectavit." — Epist. cccxix.

² "Donec aut nos cum fidelibus ecclesiæ Dei potuissent perimere, aut Saracenos, quos jam per suos familiarissimos æquè Saracenos invitaverant, in Romanam urbem ad perditionem omnium intromittere valuissent." — Ibid. The letter which relates this conspiracy and the excommunication is addressed to the bishops of Gaul and Germany; and it is remarkable that it dwells strongly on the conspiracy being an act of treason, not to the Church only, but "contra salutem reipublicæ et regni dilecti filii nostri, Caroli, serenissimi principis."

and an attempt to raise Bulgaria into a new province independent of the Pope. From early times the Bishop of Rome in his person had been less an object of awe and less secure in Rome than in any part of his spiritual dominions; but this conspiracy anticipated the coming darkness of the next century. Either the Pope grounded on a false and wicked invention, or, at the best, on an unwarranted suspicion, this most terrible accusation; or there were persons of the highest rank in the service of the Pope, so blinded with faction, so infatuated with crime (for, according to the Pope, they were men of the most rapacious and licentious habits), on whom their allegiance to the Pope hung so loosely as not to make them shudder at shedding the blood of the successor of St. Peter, or at surrendering the metropolis of Christendom to the unbeliever.

Almost the first act of Marinus,¹ the successor of John VIII., was the absolution of Formosus, Pope Mari-
his release from his oath not to enter Rome,² nus.
Dec. 882. and his reconciliation with the Holy See. The decided partisanship of this measure declares the triumph of the German faction, and makes it more probable that the vacancy was caused by violent means. The enforced acknowledgment of Charles the Fat, as the master of the whole Carlovingian empire, by John VIII., would not necessarily combine the factions arrayed against each other during years of fierce animosity. It was a German Emperor who again ruled the world, and his

¹ Marinus, or Martinus II., 882, died May or June 884.

² Formosus had sworn (at Troyes, Sept. 14, 878) never to enter Rome, or to resume his episcopal dignity. "Formosus enim nequam angustatus jurejurando promisit: ut Romuleam urbem nunquam ingrederetur, ad reconciliationem sui honoris nunquam accederet, suumque episcopatum nunquam reciperet." — *Auxilii Trec. apud Mabillon, Analect. Vet. p. 51.*

supporters would seize the opportunity of more than triumph, of revenge. The short pontificate of Marinus was followed by the still shorter rule of Hadrian III., which lasted but fourteen months. That of Stephen V., though not of longer duration, witnessed events of far more importance to the papacy, to Italy, and to Christendom.

On the death of Charles the Fat, the ill-cemented edifice of the Carlovingian empire, the discordant materials of which had reunited, not by natural affinity, but almost by the force of accident, dissolved again, and for ever. The legitimate race of Charlemagne expired in the person of his unworthy descendant, whose name, derived from mere physical bulk, contrasted with the mental greatness, the commanding qualities of military, administrative, and even intellectual superiority, which had blended with the name of the first Charles the appellation of the Great.

CHAPTER VII.

ANARCHY OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE PAPACY.

AT the expiration of the Carlovingian dynasty the question between the conflicting claims of the Transalpine sovereigns to the Empire was for a short time in abeyance. Italy aspired to name her own king, to assume that the Empire belonged of right to the King of Italy. But there was no one of her dukes, either of Lombard or Italian descent, so preëminent in power and influence as to command the unanimous assent: no Pope on the throne of Rome who could seize this glorious opportunity of securing the independence of Italy. Pope had been following Pope in rapid succession; and the feuds in Italy and in Rome, though the main cause of their animosity, the Imperial title, might seem removed, raged with unallayed ferocity. Berengar and Guido, Duke of Spoleto, and Berengar, Duke of Friuli, were put forward as competitors for the empire by their respective partisans in the South and in the North. At first Berengar and Guido agreed amicably to share the spoil. Guido hoped to obtain the Transalpine, Berengar the Cisalpine dominions.¹ But Guido had formed some wild hopes of succeeding peaceably to the French dominions of Charles the Fat.

Berengar and Guido assume the crown of Italy.

¹ Liutprand, apud Pertz, p. 250.

He entered, it is said, into an amicable arrangement with Berengar; and while his antagonist was strengthening his interest in Italy, crossed the Alps on his adventurous quest after the crown of Burgundy. He returned with the shame of having been scorned and foiled in this enterprise, and with the just imputation, which probably affected him much more, of having broken faith with Berengar, and so weakened the claims which he hastened to resume upon the kingdom of Italy. The dukes and counts of Italy were divided. Those of Spoleto, Camerina, Tuscany, joined the banner of Guido; the Lombards were generally on the side of Berengar. The bishops did not stand aloof from the war; they appeared in arms on either side. Yet the general feeling was still so strong against the unseemliness of Christian prelates mingling in battle, that the poetical panegyrist of Berengar, out of respect for the sacred ministry, refuses to record their names.¹ Two bloody battles were fought, one in the Brescian territory, one near the Trebia. In the last Guido won the victory, and took possession of Pavia, with great part of Lombardy. An assembly of bishops in Pavia assumed the right of electing Guido to the kingdom of Italy.² After the death of Marinus, Hadrian III. had ruled rather more than one obscure

Popes Hadrian III. and Stephen V.

¹ Apud Muratori, t. ii. p. 1. Throughout this poem Berengar is an Italian; Wido (Guido), a Gaul (Gallicus ductor); Arnulf, a German: he is the "Ductor Barbarus." The national distinctions and national animosities are growing more marked and strong.

² See in Muratori the decrees of this Council. There is a remarkable popular provision. The commonalty (plebei homines) were to be governed by their law. All illegal exaction or oppression was prohibited. Such injuries were to be redressed by the count; on his neglect or refusal, by the bishop, who, for this end, was to use his power of excommunication. — Art. vii. p. 415.

year.¹ The Pope Stephen V. had been chosen during the lifetime of Charles the Fat, in the presence of the Imperial ambassador ; yet the last Carlovingian resisted the assumption of the full Papal power with- Feb. 21, 891.
out his special consent. Stephen V. was crowned by Formosus, Bishop of Porto.² Stephen had espoused the cause of Guido with ardor. The King of Italy came to Rome, and was crowned as Emperor Sept. 891.
by the Pope.³ The death of Stephen, and Formosus.
the election of Formosus to the Papacy, changed the aspect of affairs, and betrayed the hostilities still ranking at Rome. By the election of Formosus was violated the ordinary canonical rule against the translation of bishops from one see to another (Formosus was Bishop of Porto), which was still held in some respect. There were yet stronger objections to the election of a bishop who had been excommunicated by a former Pontiff, excommunicated as an accomplice in a conspiracy to murder the Pope. The excommunicated Formosus had been compelled to take an oath never to resume his episcopal functions, never to return to Rome, and never to presume but to lay communion. The successor of John had granted absolution from these penalties — from this oath. This election must have been a bold and desperate measure of an unscrupulous faction.⁴ Nor was Formosus chosen without a fierce and violent struggle.⁵ The suffrages of a party among the clergy and people

¹ May, 884; Aug., Sept., 885.

² *Invectiv. pro Formoso*, apud Anastas.

³ *Annal. Fuldens. sub ann.*

⁴ *Liutprand, sub ann. 891.*

⁵ "Stephano quoque Papa, Adriani filio, viam universæ terræ ingresso, adunati sunt episcopi proceresque tui, clerici quoque et populus cunctaque vulgi manus, et venerunt in sedem Portuensem infra urbem sitam, cui Formosus præerat, papam eum acclamantes " — *Auxil. Trec. apud Mabill*

had already fallen upon Sergius. He was actually at the altar preparing for the solemn ceremony of inauguration, when he was torn away by the stronger faction. Formosus, chosen, as his partisans declared, for his superior learning and knowledge of the Scripture, was then invested in the Papal dignity. Sergius fled to Tuscany, which adhered to the cause of Guido, or an Italian Emperor. Formosus and his faction may have preferred the common Papal policy, which dreaded the dangerous neighborhood, it might be the despotic power, of an Italian Emperor, and, as churchmen, thought the pontifical power more secure under the protection of a remote Transalpine Emperor. Personal hostility to Guido may have allied itself with this feeling; yet was Formosus compelled to send the Imperial diadem to Lambert, the son of Guido.¹ Already the Formosans were in correspondence with Arnulf, whom Germany at least had then acknowledged as the heir, though illegitimate, of the Carolingian house, — the sole heir of that famous race. Already Arnulf had claimed and exercised a kind of imperial supremacy. His authority ratified the election of King Boso to the throne of Arles (or Provence). He had threatened to descend on Italy at the first assumption of the kingly title by Berengar; but Berengar, eager for his revenge against Guido, now joined in the invitation of the Transalpine sovereign.²

Arnulf crossed the Alps at the head of a powerful

¹ Jaffé adopts this chronology seemingly on strong grounds. But I cannot help suspecting that this is an anticipation of the act of submission from Formosus, after the retreat of Arnulf.

² Document in Muratori, 893; Annal. Fuldens. Arnulf is summoned 'ad Italicum regnum et res S. Petri a malis Christianis cruendum.'

army. He was received in Verona by Berengar, and one terrible example of German ^{Arnulf in Italy} ferocity prostrated Italy at his feet in shuddering consternation. Bergamo dared to offer resistance; he hung the Count in full armor and with all the ornaments of his rank before the gates, and gave the town up to pillage.¹ In the language of the day, it made the ears of all who heard tingle. Milan and Pavia opened their gates. Guido fled to his territory of Spoleto. Even the powerful princes, the Marquis of Tuscany among the rest, were unable to stand before the terrors of the German arms. Their presumption in claiming certain feudal rights was resented by Arnulf. They were compelled to swear allegiance to Arnulf, as King of Italy; the claims of Berengar were dismissed with silent contempt.² But Italy, as usual, revenged herself by her climate on the northern army. Sicknes broke out, and Arnulf turned back to the Alps. No sooner was he withdrawn than the party of Guido, now strengthened by many other Italian princes, who had been offended by the pride of the Barbarian Arnulf, rose up and threw off the yoke. Guido had died,³ but his son Lambert, already his colleague, assumed alone

¹ The siege is described in the poem concerning Berengar. Neither the churches, nor the sacred virgins, nor the priests, whose hands were wont to be kissed after the celebration of the mass, were respected:

“Ecce verenda prius nullo sub honore tenentur
Atria, nam scissis pereunt velamina vittis
Virginis, impulsusque sacer fugit ipse minister,
Quorundam stringunt ambas quia vincula palmas,
Oscula quæ solitæ sacris sentire litatis.”

—iii. p. 397.

² Anonym. Salernit. I follow Muratori in the sequence and dates of these events.

³ The prayers of the clergy, according to Berengar's panegyrist, had hastened Guido's death. — iii. p. 399

the kingdom of Italy and the Imperial crown. Even Pope Formosus was obliged to affect an ill-assumed concord with the Italian Lambert.¹

But the next year² appeared again the invincible Arnulf. Italy quailed before him. Arnulf treated the claims of Berengar and Lambert with impartial contempt. Every city and castle hastened to tender submission. Though Italy's best allies, disease and pestilence, had already begun again to weaken the German army, and gathering movements in the north under Berengar threatened to cut off the retreat to the Alps, Arnulf reached the gates of Rome at the earnest supplication of Formosus, now the captive of his subjects.³ For there the faction adverse to the Pope Formosus had gained the mastery. They had the boldness, and imagined that they had strength to re-

Sept. 895.
Arnulf again
in Italy.

In Rome.

sist. Preparations were made for defence. Arnulf moved with his whole army to the siege of the imperial city, to the release of the Pope. A trivial accident betrayed Rome into his hands. A hare startled by the noise ran towards the city, followed by a hooting multitude. The Romans mistook this for a general assault, were seized with a panic, and many threw themselves over the walls. The Leonine quarter was easily taken; the whole city submitted to the conqueror. The first act of the ally and

¹ "De ipso Lamberto, patris se curam habere, filii que carissimi loco eum diligere, atque inviolabilem cum eo concordiam se velle servare." — Frodoard Hist. Rem.

² During this year Arnulf had shown himself a faithful son of the Church, at the Council of Tribur, in which he had confirmed the power and privileges of the clergy, and recognized the supremacy of Rome.

³ Liutprand, i. 8. "A Romanis vehementer afflictabatur." — Hermann Contract. in Chronic.

deliverer of the Pope was publicly to behead the chiefs of the opposite faction. The first act of the grateful Formosus was the coronation of Arnulf as Emperor. He declared null, as ex-
April, 896.
Coronation of
Arnulf by
Formosus.
 tortured by compulsion, the inauguration of Lambert. The next day the people were summoned to take the oath of allegiance to the Emperor. The oath was in these words: "I swear by these holy mysteries, that, saving my honor, my law, and the fidelity I owe to my Lord the Pope Formosus, I both am and will be faithful all my life to the Emperor Arnulf; that I will never assist Lambert the son of Ageltruda, nor Ageltruda herself, nor be accessory to the surrender of the city to either of them, or to their followers."

Arnulf ventured to remain in Rome no more than fifteen days. He left Farold, one of his great vassals, as governor and protector of the city. He marched towards Spoleto, where Ageltruda, the widow of Guido, had taken refuge. As he approached that city, he was seized with a paralytic disorder, attributed to poison administered to him by a servant of Ageltruda. Already was this crime in Italy the suspected cause of every sudden death or dangerous malady. He hastened almost as a fugitive to Germany. Though of the German party, Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona, sees the hand of God in this shameful flight of Arnulf. The Italian hatred of the German breaks through even party feeling "Not merely did Arnulf assume all the glory of his victories to himself, instead of referring them to God, but the conduct of his troops demanded the divine vengeance. Priests were led about in chains; nuns violated; even the churches were no asylas; the soldiers held their profane orgies, performed their shame-

less acts, sang their ribald songs, indulged in the open prostitution of women, within the consecrated walls."

Before Arnulf had crossed the Alps, the Pope Formosus had died; all Italy had risen. The two factions of Berengar and Lambert were equally hostile to the Germans. Arnulf's governor in Rome seems to have exercised no influence in the election of the Pope, which was carried at once by the opposite party. The choice fell on Boniface VII. The new pontiff labored under the imputation of having been twice deposed for his profligate and scandalous life, first from the subdiaconate, afterwards from the priesthood. Boniface died of the gout fifteen days after his elevation. The Italian party hastened to the election of Stephen VI. Probably the German governor had withdrawn before Stephen and his faction proceeded to wreak their vengeance on the lifeless remains of Formosus.¹ Fierce political animosity took the form of ecclesiastical solemnity. The body was disinterred, dressed in the papal habiliments, and, before a council assembled for the purpose, addressed in these words: "Wherefore wert thou, being Bishop of Porto, tempted by ambition to usurp the Catholic see of Rome?" The deacon who had been assigned as counsel for the dead maintained a prudent silence. The sacred vestments were then stripped from the body, three of the fingers cut off, the body cast into the Tiber. All who had been ordained by Formosus were re-ordained by Stephen. Such, however, were the vicissitudes of popular feeling in Rome, that some years after

¹ Liutprand attributes the violation of the tomb of Formosus to Sergius, his former rival: he must be corrected by the acts of the Council of Rome under John IX. — Labbe, p. 502.

a miracle was said to have asserted the innocence of Formosus. His body was found by fishermen in the Tiber, and carried back for burial in the church of St. Peter. As the coffin passed, all the images in the church reverentially bowed their heads.¹

The pontificate of Stephen soon came to an end. A new revolution revenged the disinterment of the insulted prelate. And now the fierceness of political, rather than religious faction, had utterly destroyed all reverence for the sacred person of the Pope. Stephen was thrown into prison by his enemies, and strangled.² The convenient charge of usurpation, always brought against the Popes whom their adversaries dethroned or put to death, may have reconciled their minds to the impious deed, but it is difficult to discover in what respect the title of Pope Stephen VI. was defective.

Pope now succeeded Pope with such rapidity as to awaken the inevitable suspicion, either that those were chosen who were likely to make a speedy vacancy; or they received but a fatal gift in the pontificate of Rome. Romanus and Theodorus II. survived their promotion each only a few months.³ The latter, by his restoration

¹ "Hoc namque a *religiosissimis* Romanis persape audi." — Liutprand.

² See Flodoard, and the epitaph on Stephen, found in the time of Alexander III. After stating that "*reputet Formosi spurca superbi crimina,*" it says —

"Captus et a sede pulsus ad ima fuit
Carceris interea vinclis constrictus, et uno
Strangulatus nervo, exiit et hominem."

³ A.D. 897, Romanus, July, Nov.

"Quatuor haud plenos tractans in culmine menses."

Flodoard.

Theodorus II., Nov. Dec. Flodoard says that he sat only twenty days. Some months must have slipped out. Theodorus had time to reverse the decrees of Stephen, and solemnly to reinter Formosus. Theodorus seems to have aimed at reconciling the parties.

"Hic populum docuit connectere vincula pacis
Atque sacerdotes concordii junxit honore."

Flodoard.

of Formosus to the rights of Christian burial, and by his reversal of the acts of Stephen VI., may be presumed to have belonged to that faction. The next election was contested with all the strength and violence of the adverse parties. John IX. was successful; his competitor, Sergius, according to some accounts formerly the discomfited competitor of Formosus, and his bitter and implacable enemy, fled to the powerful protection of the Marquis of Tuscany.¹

John IX. was not content with the replacement of John IX. the remains of Formosus in the sacred quiet of the tomb. He determined to crush the opposing party by the decree of a Council. This Council—for the dominant assembly was always a Council (that of which the decrees were to be revoked was degraded to a synod)—annulled at once the unprecedented judgment passed on a dead body; it excused those who were present at that synod, as acting under compulsion, and severely condemned all who should use such violence against the clergy. It declared that the translation of Formosus from another see, though justified by necessity in his case, was not to be drawn into a precedent. The orders which he had bestowed were confirmed, the reordinations condemned. It sentenced the

¹ In the strange confusion which prevails throughout this period, it is doubtful whether this election of Sergius and his flight to the court of Tuscany did take place on two occasions, or whether the first is not an anticipation of the event which now took place.

“*Pellitur urbe pater, pervadit sacra Joannes,
Romuleosque greges dissipat ipse lupus.*”

So writes the hostile author of the *Epitaphium Sergii apud Pagi*. The more friendly Flodoard—

“*Joannes subit hic qui fulsit in ordine nonus,
Pellitur electus patriâ quo Sergius urbe,
Romulidumque gregum quidam traduntur abacti.*”

decrees of that synod to be burned. But June, 898. though John IX. was thus avowedly of the party of Formosus, he found it expedient to submit to the Italian Emperor. The title of Lambert was fully recognized at Rome: the coronation of the Barbarian Arnulf,¹ rejected with scorn. The secret of this apostasy was the utter extinction of the German party. Arnulf, by his flight, had become contemptible to the whole of Italy; and he was known to be dying of a slow disease. The Council endeavored to secure the more peaceful election and consecration of the Popes. The people were to demand, the bishops and clergy to elect, and immediately to consecrate in the presence of the Imperial Legates. No oaths or promises were to be extorted from a new Pope, except those sanctioned by ancient custom. Another canon prohibited the strange practice, which nevertheless had defied all authority of law, the right of plundering the Pope's palace immediately on his decease.

Nor did Pope John IX. lose the opportunity of condemning his rival Sergius, by the authority of a Council. He was excommunicated, with several other priests and inferior clergy, as accessory to the insults against the body of Formosus. Sergius laughed to scorn the thunders of his rival, so long as he was under the protection of the powerful House of Tuscany.

With John IX. closed the ninth century of Christianity; the tenth, in Italy at least, the iron Died July, A.D. 901. age, had already darkened upon Rome; the Pontificate had been won by crime and vacated by murder.

¹ Jaffé must be right in reading Arnulfi for Berengarii. — Regesta, p. 304

CHAPTER VIII.

CONVERSION OF BULGARIA.

YEI in remoter regions, even during the ninth century, Christianity was gathering in nations of converts. One man, indeed, who is deeply involved in the fierce contests, loaded with the heaviest charges of guilt, struck by the condemning thunderbolts of the Church, and after a short period of hard-won power as Pope, dragged from his grave, insulted, then restored and canonized; the Pope Formosus, thus at once a leading actor and the victim in these fatal feuds, is described, by a poetical panegyrist, as the Apostle of the Bulgarians, the destroyer of their temples, as having endured many perils in order to subdue them to the faith.¹ The perils of Formosus as a missionary are the embellishments of the poet.² Formosus went into Bulgaria as a legate from Pope Nicolas, some time after the conversion of the King, in order to complete the Christianization of the people, and to correct the errors which they had learned from their first teachers, the Greeks.

¹ "Præsul hic egregius Formosus laudibus alter
Evehitur, castus, parvus sibi, largus egenis,
Bulgarie genti fidei qui semina sparsit,
Delubra destruxit, populum cælestibus armis
Instruxit, *tolerans discrimina plurima.*"

Flodoard, apud Mabillon, Secl. iii. Benedict.

² Anastasius in Vit. Formosi.

The name of the Bulgarians, a race next to the Huns, the most terrible and most hateful to the invaded Europeans, was known in the West as ^{The Bulgarians.} early as the reign of Theodoric the Ostrogoth.¹ Their Asiatic residence had been on the shores of the Volga; it is disputed whether the river took its name from the people, or the people from the river. In Europe, either mingled with, or bordering upon the Slavonians, they spread over a large tract of territory, from the shores of the Palus Mæotis and the Euxine, along the course of the Lower Danube. While the Teutonic tribes had gradually yielded to the mild yoke of Christianity (the fierce Northmen alone, who poured forth in their piratical vessels from the lakes and the havens on the Baltic and the German Ocean, still remaining heathen), for three centuries no impression seems to have been made on the Bulgarians or the Slavonians, who occupied the north-eastern frontier of the Empire. They were still rude, warlike, and chiefly pastoral tribes, inaccessible alike to the civilization and the religion of Rome. The Eastern Empire had neither a Charlemagne, to compel by force of arms, nor zealous monkish missionaries, like those of Germany, to penetrate the vast plains and spreading morasses of the re-barbarized province on either side of the Danube; to found abbacies and bishoprics, to cultivate the soil, and reclaim the people.

The first establishment of Christianity in Bulgaria took place in the ninth century. There is a ^{First conversion.} strange uniformity in the instruments employed in the conversion of barbarous Princes, and

¹ Eunod. Panegyric, in the sixth century. Pope John VIII., with the total ignorance of history not uncommon, asserts that the Bulgarians had been under the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff since the time of Pope Damasus — Epist. lxxviii.

through the Princes of their barbarous subjects. A female of rank and influence, a zealous monk, some fearful national calamity; no sooner do these three agencies coincide, than the heathen land opens itself to Christianity.¹

The sister of Bogoris, the King of Bulgaria, had A.D. 863, 864. fallen in her childhood into the hands of the Greek Emperor; she had been a captive for thirty-eight years, and had been educated at Constantinople in the Christian faith. A monk, Theodosius Cupharas, had been long a bond slave in Bulgaria. During certain negotiations to avert war between the Empress Theodora and the Bulgarian King, an exchange was proposed of the captive Princess for the learned monk. If the monk had made any impression on the Barbarian Monarch, the gentle importunity of his sister still more favorably disposed him to the cause of Christ. A pestilence ravaged Bulgaria; and with that facility with which all polytheists try the powers of conflicting deities, Bogoris did not scruple to adore the God of his sister. The plague was stayed; the King acknowledged the might and the goodness of the Christian's God, but feared to encounter the more bigoted and obstinate Paganism of his subjects. He chose a singular method to undermine their prejudice. There were two monks from Constantinople, sons of Leo of Thessalonica, distinguished for holiness, zeal, and learning; Cyril (his proper name was Constantine) was familiar with the Greek, Latin, Sclavonian, Armenian, and Khazarian languages. The other, Methodius, was a monk, whose skill in painting had excited the wonder of the Barbarians. By the intelligible preaching of

¹ Theophanes, Chronograph.

this wonderful art, King Bogoris hoped to familiarize men's minds with the tenets of the Gospel.¹ A. D. 863, 864. But he knew his people; images of terror alone would touch their savage hearts. By his advice, Methodius painted the Last Judgment; he represented the punishment of the damned with all the horrors his imagination could suggest, or his pencil execute. The King shuddered at the awful spectacle by which he had thought to alarm others: he earnestly solicited Theodora for a priest to unite him to those sons of the Church who could alone hope for escape from that horrible destiny. The image-worshipping Empress, delighted at once with the progress of Christianity, and this testimony to the power of painting, lost no time in despatching a Bishop on this important mission. But the nobles of Bulgaria, and the mass of the people, were unmoved by the terrors which agitated the inmost soul of the King. The ceremony of the royal baptism could only be ventured under the veil of darkness; and no sooner had the secret transpired than a formidable insurrection broke out in favor of the national gods. The rebels invested the palace, threatened the King with death, and were prepared to raise a new sovereign to the throne.² But the faith of Bogoris was firm; he marched out to meet his revolted subjects with the cross upon his breast, and with only forty-eight attendants. At the sight of the courageous monarch, a sudden panic seized the insurgents; they fled on all sides. The King's vengeance showed no great progress in Christian humanity; he put to death all the rebel-

¹ Cedren. Hist. l. 2, p. 152. Symeon Logothet. apud Theophan. Contin p. 664. Zonaras.

² Nicol. I. Respons. xvii.

lions nobles, with their families, not sparing an infant. To the lower orders his clemency granted a general amnesty.

Constantine, who is better known under his name of Cyril, who had been long employed in the conversion of the Khazars, on the north shore of the Euxine, was now sent by the Empress Theodora to complete the conversion of the people. Cyril spent some time in the country, and then passed on to the spiritual conquest of Moravia.

But the King of Bulgaria, either from the ardent interest which his new religion had awakened in his mind, or with political objects, aspired to enter into relations with Western Christendom. The fame of the Pope, and his acknowledged supremacy in the West, as well as his claim to be the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ throughout the world, had reached the fervent proselyte. The brother of the King appeared in Rome to request the advice of the Pope on matters which perplexed the yet uninstructed faith of the barbarous nation. The contempt and hatred of the Bulgarians for the Greeks may have led them to suspect the purity of faith derived from that quarter. The quarrel for the See of Constantinople between Ignatius and Photius was at its height: and this suspicion may have been deepened by the well-timed or accidental visits of Latin missionaries. Hence the Bulgarians may have determined to have their Christianity from the highest authority.

The 106 questions submitted to the Pope by the King of Bulgaria, embrace every point of ecclesiastical discipline, of ceremonial observance, and of manners.

The Pope was Nicolas I., a prelate, whose name

might well have spread into the remotest regions, with all the awfulness which belonged to a supreme pontiff. Nicolas replied to these questions in a tone mild, Christian, and parental, except towards apostates to heathenism. His answers tend in general with wise discretion to mitigate the ferocity of a savage nation.¹

The King of Bulgaria is gently reminded that he has adopted the worship of a more merciful God; that the careless and Eastern prodigality with which he was accustomed to sacrifice human life was inconsistent with his new faith. The conscience of Bogoris was haunted by compunction for the massacre of his nobles. The Pope censures the cruelty, which involved the innocent children in the crime of their fathers; yet the massacre, as executed from zeal towards God, might be atoned for by penance. Nicolas should perhaps not be harshly judged for this leniency towards a passed and irrevocable act of barbarity, perpetrated under such circumstances. Apostates from the faith, who refuse to listen to the admonitions of their spiritual fathers, are to receive no toleration from the government,² but those without the Church God alone will judge. The simple people had inquired whether it was lawful to pray for their fathers who had died in unbelief; the Pope sternly prohibits this vain mark of filial affection. He could not, even if he would, mitigate the damnation of their fathers without weakening one of the most effective arguments for their conversion. But no violence

¹ "Veruntamen absit a mentibus vestris, ut tam impie jam judicetis, quam tam pium Deum et dominum agnovistis; præsertim cum magis oporteat ut sicut hactenus ad mortem facile quosque pertraxistis, ita deinceps non ad mortem, sed ad vitam quos potestis nihilominus perducatis." — No. xxv., Labbe, Concil., p. 527.

² xviii. xlii.

was to be used against those who continued to worship idols, only all communion was to be avoided with them. The power which Nicolas demanded for the clergy was, in some degree, no doubt intended to soften the barbarity of the people.¹ The laws were to take their course against all ordinary crimes; but even the adulterer, the murderer, the parricide, if he could reach the asylum of the Church, was under the protection of the Bishop, and to be judged by his milder judgment. Torture for the purpose of obtaining evidence is strongly prohibited.²

The Pope did not attempt to extinguish the passion for war in a people like the Bulgarians, even if he had any sense of its incongruity with the Gospel. They were to go to battle no longer under their old national ensign, the horse-tail, but under the banner of the Cross. On the question whether they were to refrain from going out to battle on holy days, he is guarded, and allows large discretion for cases of necessity. Instead of observing fortunate days and hours before they went to war, and using enchantments, sports, plays,³ songs and auguries, they were to go to the Church, to make offerings, to confess to the priests, and to perform such acts of charity as opening the prisons, emancipating slaves, and almsgiving to the poor. They had a stern but, no

¹ Awe of the priesthood was a first element of their Christianity. A Greek, pretending to be a priest, had profanely baptised many Bulgarians. The king, having detected him *by the inspiration of God*, had ordered him to have his nose and ears cut off, to be severely scourged, and expelled the kingdom. The Pope reproves the inhumanity of this punishment, and admits all the baptisms as valid. — No. lxxxvi. viii.

² No. xiv. xv. No. lxxxvi.

³ What were these *joci*? war dances, or ludicrous exhibitions of dwarfs and buffoons, such as delight savages? The Pope afterwards, in condescension to the weakness of their faith, permits such amusements, *except* during Lent. — No. xlvii. No. xxxiii. iv.

doubt for discipline very effective usage, that before battle some tried warrior inspected the arms and the horse of each soldier; where they were found neglected or unfit for use, he put the offender to death. The Pope ingeniously suggests that greater attention should be paid to the spiritual preparation of the soldier.¹

On the ancient superstitions and manners of these barbarians these questions are less particular than will satisfy the curious inquirer. The king was accustomed to eat alone, not even his wife might sit down in his presence.² The Pope gently persuades to a more sociable and humble demeanor, alleging the example of the Son of God, who condescended to eat with his disciples. The warlike people were accustomed to administer their oaths on a sword driven into the earth as the most sacred symbol. The Pope commands them to substitute the Holy Gospels.

Polygamy he strictly forbids; whoever, according to the ancient usages of the people, had two wives, was to confine himself to the first.³ Marriage within the prohibited degrees is interdicted, and spiritual consanguinity is declared to be equally close with that of blood: intermarriage with a godfather or his offspring is as incestuous as with an actual parent or kindred. The Pope delights in condemning some minute and superstitious usages enjoined by the Greeks in the marriage ceremonial and in the observance of Lent; his rule is of course that of the Roman Church. Nicolas sums up

¹ Nicolas quotes Ps. xxxiii. 17, and Prov. xxi. 31. "The horse is prepared against the day of battle, but safety is of the Lord."

² No. xliii.

³ There was a singular question, whether after conversion they were bound to wear breeches (*femoralia*). The Pope answers that religion has nothing to do with their ordinary dress; and extricates himself by giving the question a spiritual turn.—lix.

the whole with a solemn warning against the errors of the Greeks and Armenians, and earnestly persuades adherence to the one immaculate Church, that of Rome.¹

The allegiance of the Bulgarian Church to the Patriarch of Constantinople or to the successor of St. Peter was an object of contest during several centuries. Each could adduce evidence of voluntary submission on the part of the Bulgarians, the Greek the commencement, the Latin the completion, of the conversion. The Popes rested their claim not solely on their universal supremacy, but on that of the Archbishop of Thessalonica, to whose jurisdiction the province belonged, and who, as an Illyrian Metropolitan, was asserted to be under ancient subordination to Rome. The strife endured through the papacy of Nicolas and Hadrian II. Many angry and some expostulatory letters appear among those of John VIII. to Paul Bishop of Thessalonica: and during his own papacy Formosus steadily urged the work of conversion. The King Michael (such was the baptismal name of the Barbarian Bogoris after the Emperor of the East) must have been perplexed to hear that he had only learned error and heresy from his Greek teachers, that he was no Christian worshipper, but a blasphemer.² "It might even have been worse. Would he have embraced the Christianity of Constantinople when that city held Arian or Macedonian doctrines? If he had so done, he would have become a convert only to perish with his teachers in everlasting

¹ A more memorable question is what they are to do with certain profane books which they had taken from the Saracens (where and at what period does not appear). The reply of the Pope is in the true spirit of Amrou, "Let them be burned." — No. ciii.

² Joann. VIII. Epist. lxxv. et seq. See on the other side the letter of Photius; a full defence of the Greek points of difference. Epist. l.

fire. The only security was in the irreprehensible Church of Rome." Ignatius was Patriarch of Constantinople when the Greek Bishops were warned to withdraw from the spiritual territory of Rome. But even Ignatius, though bound by his interests and gratitude to the unshaken supporter of his claims to the Patriarchate against the usurper Photius, would not surrender the rights of his Church over the Bulgarians. Ignatius, the Holy Patriarch of Constantinople, became almost as odious at Rome as his exiled rival Photius. This contumacy contributed to throw the Pope, contrary to the policy of his predecessors, and to the indignation of the West, which has been perpetuated by later writers, on the side of Photius. The hopes of the surrender of the Bulgarian provinces was among the temptations which induced John VIII. to acknowledge the title of Photius. Centuries did not reconcile the strife.

The Greek missionaries in the mean time, Methodius and Cyril, were passing on to new Christian conquests. The wars of Charlemagne had disseminated some compulsory Christianity among certain of the Slavian tribes. Other partial attempts had been made, especially by the Archbishop of Salzburg.

Radislav, the Prince of Moravia, standing in need of a political alliance with the Emperor Michael, readily admitted these indefatigable monks into his kingdom. Before long the king, his brother, and the people were baptised, a church was built in honor of the Virgin Mary at Wilibrad,¹ and the Christian priests were held in such high respect by the nation that they were called by the name of Princes.²

¹ Wilibrad, now Hradisch.—Palacky, i. p. 122.

² The Church of Olmutz boasted higher antiquity; it was *rebuilt* by King Radislav and Cyril.

Christianity brought other gifts in her train. The Slavian dialects were as yet unwritten : their alphabet was the invention of Cyril.¹ This pious man and his colleagues not only so far mastered the language as to preach with success ; they translated, it is said, the Bible, probably certain books of the Scripture, into the dialect of Moravia, and even ventured to celebrate the services of the Church in that tongue. This great question as to the celebration of the Liturgy in the vulgar tongue of those barbarous nations who might embrace the faith, had raised no jealousy in the East, where Greek was so widely spoken. The translation of the Bible into the Mæso-gothic by Ulphilas had been hailed as a triumph of the faith.

Except perhaps among the Anglo-Saxons of Britain and the remoter parts of Germany which were subdued to Christianity by the sword of Charlemagne, throughout Western Christendom a large part of the population was Roman, or provincials who spoke Latin. At first the clergy continued to be of Roman descent. New languages were forming in Italy, Spain, and Gaul on a Latin groundwork ; the Latin services of the Church, therefore, ceased, only gradually and partially, to be intelligible to the common ear. No doubt the constant repetition of these services in the Church contributed to give the Latin element the predominance in these mingled languages ; and the transition was so irregular and imperceptible that there would be no precise time at which the sacred Latin would be called upon to abdicate its immemorial use as the Liturgical language. The

¹ The Pope (John VIII.) ascribes the invention of the Slavian alphabet to Constantine the *philosopher* (Cyril), as if his philosophy had been called into use in this good work.

Church could follow with difficulty, even in her popular preaching, these shifting and unsettled forms of speech.¹ Even in the more Teutonic parts of Germany, though the German language, in its various dialects, was beginning to sever Germany from France, the Latin and German or Theotisce oath taken at the treaty of Strasburg (the Latin by Charles, the German by Louis), was at once the sign and the commencement of the estrangement and future oppugnancy of the Latin and Teutonic. Still even in German Germany Latin had already gained and strove to maintain, through the clergy, its sacred and venerable character.

But among the Slavian tribes the Greek missionaries had penetrated into regions of unmingled Barbarism, where the mass of the people were entirely unacquainted with either of the two great languages of the Roman Empire. Rome by some untraced connection which had grown up between these Greek missionaries in Slavonia and the Roman See (the monks were probably image-worshippers, and so refused obedience to Iconoclastic Constantinople)² was called upon to decide this important question. The missionaries Methodius and Cyril, who were supposed guilty of propagating the fatal errors of the Greeks in Bulgaria, appear in Rome as the recognized apostles of the Slaves. They brought

¹ Charlemagne ordered Paulus Diaconus (in 782) to make a collection of his Latin sermons for his whole realm. Successive Councils—at Arles (Can. x.) and Tours (Can. iv. xvii.), as well as Rheims (xiv. xv.) and Mentz (xxv.)—commanded preaching in German as well as in Latin. The Heliand, the Muspelli, and still earlier poetic versions or paraphrases of Scripture, are of the reign of Louis the Pious and of his sons. — Gfrörer *die Karolinger*, i. 66. The subject will be resumed. The author of the *Chronica*. Salernit. (written in Lower Italy) speaks of the "*Lingua Tedesca quod olim Longobardi loquebantur.*"

² Methodius, it must be remembered, was a Painter.

the welcome offering of the reliques of Clement, the successor of St. Peter, which Cyril boasted to have found on the barbarous shores of the Euxine. Their creed was examined, declared unimpeachable Cyril died in Rome. Methodius was acknowledged as Archbishop of Moravia and returned with that title to his diocese. According to one account, somewhat legendary in its tone, at an early period under Nicolas I. and his successor Hadrian an amicable discussion took place, and Cyril by a triumphant inference from the words of the Psalm, "Let every spirit praise the Lord," (and if every spirit should praise the Lord, why are not the praises of the Lord in the mass and the canonical prayers to be sung in the Slavian tongue?) overcame the scruples of the Pope.

The controversy was renewed during the pontificate of John VIII. The Pope at first prohibited this departure from ancient usage, this desecration of the Church services by their celebration in a barbarous tongue.¹ Methodius, the Archbishop of Moravia, again appeared in Rome. He was received with the utmost respect. Again his creed was pronounced unimpeachable, his labors honored with the highest praise,² and the Pope declared that God had made other languages besides the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin; that it was not inconsistent with sound doctrine to sing the mass or to read the Gospel in the Slavian language. As a mark of respect, the service and the Gospel were first to be read in Latin, and then translated for the use of those who were ignorant of that language.³

From Moravia Christianity spread into the neighbor-

¹ Epist. xciv.

² A.D. 880.

³ Epist. cxlvii.

ing Slavian principality of Bohemia. The Prince Boriwoy and his wife, afterwards the Sainted Ludmila, were admitted to baptism. Swatopluk, who valiantly, if not without perfidy, had thrown off the German yoke, and vindicated the liberties of Moravia, had married a Bohemian princess, sister of Boriwoy. The patriotic historian rejects as an unworthy fable that, so long as the Bohemian was a Pagan the Christian Swatopluk would only permit her to sit at a lower table in the banquet; he rejects also a rebellion of the Bohemian subjects of Boriwoy in favor of their native gods. Ludmila outlived her two sons, successively Princes of Bohemia;¹ but she had watched with more than a mother's care, a Christian mother's, the growth of her grandson Wenzel, under whose reign Christianity won the complete conquest of Bohemia, and who died not indeed by a brother's hand but by a brother's guilt, with the beauty of a martyr's death, if not absolutely as a martyr for the faith. Wenzel built churches in every city of the realm. God, says the legend, had given him such grace, that he could understand Latin books like a good Bishop, and could read Slavian without difficulty. He fulfilled all the works of faith, fed and clothed the poor, protected widows and orphans, redeemed bond-slaves, especially priests, exercised hospitality to strangers. Gentle and full of love to the high and to the low, his only care was the well-being of all. But the fierce Bohemian nobles hated the mild and peaceful Wenzel. His brother Boleslaw was at the head of a conspiracy; he attempted to assassinate the king with his own hand; the stronger Wenzel struck him down. "God forgive thee, my brother," he said; but he did

¹ Compare Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, i. p. 133.

not strike again. Wenzel was despatched by the other conspirators.

But Wenzel's work was done; Christianity remained the religion of Bohemia; Wenzel was worshipped by the people; he became the tutelar Saint of the land.¹

¹ Palacky, 210

CHAPTER IX.

THE NORTHMEN.

THE ninth century beheld also the invasion of the remoter North by Christian zeal. The intrepid missionaries penetrated into those regions which were pouring forth their swarms of pirates on all the coasts of Europe. They sought the Northmen among their own dark pine forests, their blue fiords, and icy lakes. They crossed the Baltic and assailed the last retreat of the old Teutonic divinities, where the faith appeared in its fullest mythological character, in Scandinavia.

The tide of barbaric invasion, which had been thrown back by Charlemagne, began to pour again in a different course over Western Christendom. It was no longer vast hosts, or whole nations moving in masses upon the frontiers, entire tribes crossing the Elbe, the Rhine, and the Danube, and either retiring with their plunder or forming settlements within the territory of the Empire; it was by sea, and on every coast from the British Ocean round to the Adriatic, that the heathen Northmen on one side, the Saracens on the other, threatened the conquest of Christian Europe. The Saracens contested or had won the command of the Mediterranean; all along the south they had ravaged or formed settlements. Sicily was almost entirely Saracen; and they have been seen advancing along Italy even to the gates

of Rome : a mosque threatens to rise on the ruins of St. Peter's. In the next century, from a settlement in the province of Genoa, they infested the passes of the Alps ; murdered many passing English pilgrims in the defiles ; even reached Genoa in search of plunder.¹ The Northmen in the mean time were wasting the whole of Northern Europe. From the shores of the Baltic, from the Scandinavian islands, from the gulfs and lakes, their fleets sailed on, wherever the tide or the tempest might drive them. They seemed to defy, in their ill formed barks, the wildest weather ; to be able to land on the most inaccessible shores ; to find their way up the narrowest creeks and shallowest rivers ; nothing was secure, not even in the heart of the country, from the sudden appearance of these relentless ravagers. The invasion of the piratical Northmen had disturbed the declining years of Charlemagne himself ; that sagacious king had seen their approach with prescient terror. His wise policy had planned the only sure defence against such enemies — the building and keeping afloat a powerful fleet, and the erection of strong forts, with garrisons, at the mouths of the rivers. But during the reigns of his imbecile and disunited successors, these precautions were utterly neglected. They had not an armed ship on the seas, and not a standing troop of soldiers ; the desultory forces, which they raised, dispersed immediately the campaign was over. Year after year these plundering expeditions were becoming more incessant, more ubiquitous. Not a province in any of the kingdoms, hardly a city in the most inland district escaped these terrible visitants.² The

¹ Flodoard.

There is no necessity, with Gfrörer, die Karolinger, to suppose that the

civil wars which still continued throughout these disastrous years, with the gradual decline of the warlike nobility and the absorption of the great fiefs by the churches and the monasteries, yielded up the country almost defenceless to the merciless invader. The great feudatories, the descendants of the Frankish chieftains who had conquered Gaul, and received large grants of land, were rapidly dying out. When most needed to head their hardy vassals, they had either perished in the strife between the different branches of the feeble and hostile Carolingians, or had retired into the cloister. Instead of bequeathing a noble estate, with strongly fortified castles, and a hardy band of followers, the Baron had alienated it to the all-absorbing church, and for the stronghold a peaceful and defenceless monastery had arisen. At the fatal battle of Fontanet, were said to have fallen 100,000 men. The poet, the historian, describe Fontanet as yielding up the defenceless realm to the Normans.¹ That very year, Osker, the Norman, warped up the Seine, burned Rouen; in his descent, burned the rich abbey of Jumièges. Fontenelle bought its security at a high price.² From that time every

Normans were hired or urged by the hostile sons of Louis the Pious to invade each other's dominions. Gfrörer is again too keen-sighted.

¹ According to the Ravennese biographer, 40,000 fell on the side of Lothair alone.

“*La perit de France la flor,
Et des Barons tuit le meillor,
Ainsi trovèrent Palens terre
Vuide de gens, bonne a conquerre.*”

Wace, Roman de Rou, i. p. 16.

“*Totam Franciam, militum præsidio nudam, cujus robur in bello Fontanido nuper deperierat, tantus metus corripuerat, ut Normannis nemo possit resistere, nemo possit repellere.*” — *Fragm. Historic. Duchesne, Script. Num. iii. p. 334.* See other quotations in Depping, *Histoire des Normands*, p. 68; Eginhard, *Vit. Car. p. 452.*

² See Sir F. Palgrave's picturesque description of this expedition, p. 322.

river of France was darkened with the black sails of the Normans. They sailed up the Somme — Abbeville, Amiens, all Picardy lay waste. Again they sailed up the Seine — Rouen, Paris, were in the power of the ferocious Regnar Lodbrok. They were in the Loire — Nantes, Orleans, Blois, Tours (once saved, it was believed by the all-powerful reliques of St. Martin), had been saved only to fall on the next assault into more terrible ruin: Angers, Chartres, were burned. They struck inland to Bourges, to Clermont. They were in the Garonne — Bordeaux, Toulouse, Saintonge, Auch, Limoges, Poitiers, Tarbes, were in flames. It is an appalling and significant fact that the Pope consented to transfer the useless Archbishopric of Bordeaux to Bourges, even though Bourges, in the heart of the land, had not been secure. They followed the coasts of Spain. They ran up the Groyne, the Tagus, the Guadalquivir. In the south of Spain they encountered the Saracens: near Seville met the fleets of the worshippers of Odin and the followers of Mohammed. The Arabic chronicles are not silent on the descents of these new unbelievers. They roved along the Mediterranean; they forced their way against the stream of the rapid Rhone. Arles, Nismes, even Vienne, suffered the inevitable fate of conflagration and pillage. One adventurous band had heard some vague rumors of Rome, of her vast wealth.¹ They sailed across; mistook the Magra for the Tiber; landed near the fine old Etruscan city of Luna. The Bishop and his clergy were celebrating mass on Christmas day, when they heard of these unknown strangers; they received them with courteous Christian hospitality. Hasting, the famous leader, sub-

¹ Depping, ii. 2, p. 80.

mitted to baptism. Ere long the Norman camp rang with shrieks of sorrow — Hasting was dead. Some nights after they entreated sepulture for Hasting in the holy cloister. The great captain was borne amid his weeping followers to the grave. As they were about to lower the bier, up sprang the dead man, and cut the bishop to the earth. The priests were massacred; the city plundered; all the wealth of Luna, her beautiful women, and all her youths who could run, were swept on board the fleet. So ran the Norman legend. Italian history has preserved a fragmentary record of this wild event.¹ Pisa too is said to have been surprised and sacked.

Germany was not more secure. Very early the Scheldt, the Wahl, the Lys, had been made high-roads to the mercantile cities of Flanders. Year after year, Utrecht, Antwerp, Ghent, Courtray, were pillaged. The broad Rhine was too tempting a road. Nimeguen, Cologne, Bonn, Coblenz, Bingen, even as far as Worms, opened their gates, or had their gates beaten down by the irresistible pirates. Mentz alone seems to have been secure behind her strong walls. On their descent, they sacked Treves. Archbishop Hincmar fled with the reliques of St. Remi, from Rheims: he fled to die in terror and obscurity. From some unknown cause the adventurers did not penetrate into Rheims, though they plundered all the monasteries around; but in Aix-la-chapelle the barbarous Normans pitched their camp in the palace courts of Charlemagne. Charlemagne's descendants submitted year after year

¹ Depping, 112. "Luna civitas a Normannis dolo capta." — *Fragm. Chronic.*; Muratori, *Ant. Ital.* i. 25. "La città di Luni fu disiatata per gente ultramontane." — Villani.

to ignominious capitulations. The peace which they could not win, which they rarely strove to win, with the sword, was bought by large sums of money. Charles the Bald, Louis the German, each of the conflicting kings, who called themselves the sovereigns of the empire, paid in turn this ruinous and disgraceful tribute.

The Northmen were heathens ; their ferocious religion no doubt exasperated their natural ferocity ; their gods, like themselves, were warriors and pirates. But they did not, like the Saracens, wage a religious war. Providentially these Arabs of the sea had no Mohammed to organize the Scandinavian tribes into one vast host ; to give them the unity and force of a new Northern Caliphate. They had no ambition to propagate their faith. Perhaps they would have been unwilling to share with others the protection of their warlike gods. They had rather that their enemies should believe in a milder religion, which yielded them up unresisting, or feebly resisting, to the plunderer or the conqueror. They destroyed, with indifferent ferocity, the church and the castle. Their indiscriminate rapacity plundered alike the monastery or the farm. They massacred with as little remorse the bishop or the monk, as the count or his vassal. If their chief ravages appear to have been made upon religious edifices or estates, it was only because these were more defenceless, or offered a richer booty ; and because the only chroniclers, the monks, have been more eloquent on their own sufferings ; have dwelt on the sacrilegious, more than on the inhuman acts of their common enemies. The Church now paid dearly for her wealth and possessions : the richer the abbey, the more tempting the prey, the more remorseless the plunderer. France was covered with

bishops and monks, flying from their ruined cloisters, their burning monasteries, their desolate churches, bearing with them the precious reliques of their saints—their saints who could not defend their violated sanctuaries—and so deepening the universal panic. And everywhere they went they preached despair. The Normans were the instruments in God's hands for the punishment of the sins of the people: it was vain to resist the wrath of God; and so a wretched fatalism bowed to a more utter prostration the cowed and spiritless race. Even the few ecclesiastics, who saved something from the common wreck, were taxed for the tribute paid by the kings, and bitterly taunted the kings with this profane invasion of the property of the Church. The great ecclesiastics, indeed, were not all so unwarlike; here and there an abbot took upon him the uncongenial function of captain over his own troops. In the famous siege of Paris, as it were the con- A.D. 885. summation of the Norman conquests, the defenders of the city, with the valiant Count Eudes, were the Bishop Gozlin and his nephew Ebles, Abbot of St. Denys.¹ Yet no sooner had the Normans from wandering pirates become conquerors of the soil; no sooner had they taken possession of Normandy, than they submitted to Christianity; and it is singular, that they ceased to be Teutons as well as Pagans. The followers of Rollo became Frenchmen as well as Christians; so at a later period, the Normans, already Christians, in Naples became Italians.²

¹ Depping, iii. 1, p. 218 The ten months' siege of Paris had its monkish Homer, Abbo. A later poet, more Homeric, Ariosto, had that siege in his thought when he brought the Saracen Agramont under the walls of Paris. Sir F. Palgrave has quoted some of his stanzas.

² See Guizot, *Collect. des Mémoires*, tom. vi.

Christianity had made some efforts, at an earlier period, to reach the remote regions from which issued forth these terrible Pagans, but without marked or signal success. A fortunate or providential event opened Denmark to her exertions. A contested succession to the throne of that kingdom had driven one of the princes, Harold, to the court and to the protection of Louis the Pious. Charlemagne had already, during his Saxon conquests, entered into an alliance with the ancestor of Harold. That prince embraced the faith of Christ, not only as the price of succor in the contest for his throne, but in zeal and sincerity; he was baptised at Ingelheim with great pomp in the year 826.¹ His sponsors were the Emperor, the Empress Judith, and King Lothair. The return of Harold to Denmark seemed to the Danish Prince, to the bishops of the empire, and to the pious Emperor, too favorable an opportunity to be neglected for the promulgation of the Gospel in that heathen kingdom. A zealous and devoted missionary was invited to undertake the perilous adventure.

The abbey of Corbey, near Amiens, was the great monastic institution in that part of the Empire. Among the abbots had been the famous princes Adalhard and Wala, illegitimate scions of the race of Charles Martel. In that abbey there was a monk of noble French descent, of the gentlest disposition, but of deep and settled piety.² From his childhood he had been possessed by

¹ Bishop Munter suggests, rather too positively, that the king must have made the renunciation in the form enacted by S. Boniface at the synod of Salzburg, A.D. 742.—Eccard. Franc. Orient. i. 440. "Forsachistu Diabolæ? R. Ec forsacho Diabolæ. End allum Diabold gelde. R. End ec forsacho allum Diabold gelde. End allum Diaboles Wercum end Wordum. R. End ec forsacho allum Diaboles Wercum end Wordum. Thunaer ende Woden end Saxnote; ende allem them Unholdum, the hera Genotes sint."—G. Ch. Dan. et Norw. p. 268.

² Anshar was born Sept. 8, 801.

an ardent imagination; and that imagination, as was sure to be the case in that age, had yielded itself up as a willing bond-slave of religion. At the early age of five, his mother's death had made a strong impression on the sensitive child. A remarkable dream decided his calling. In his sleep he fancied himself struggling on a miry and slippery ground, beyond which lay a beautiful meadow. There he beheld a lady of stately form, in rich attire, surrounded by females in white apparel; among them his mother. He strove to reach her, but the mire clung around his feet, and he could not struggle onward. The soft voice of the majestic lady, the Virgin herself, addressed him, "My son, wouldest thou join thy mother?" He replied, "Most earnestly do I wish it." "He who would come to us must flee those vanities which we abhor." *Æt* 13.

From that moment the serious child, abandoning all sport and gayety, was devoted to prayer and study. Up to adolescence he was educated in monastic discipline, but the ardor of youth had begun to relax his strict austerity. At that time the world was startled by the tidings of Charlemagne's death. That the mighty monarch of so many kingdoms must suffer the common mortality of man, struck the imaginative youth. His life became, as it were, one vision. Once he thought that he had died suddenly; and at the moment of his death he prayed to the apostle St. Peter and to St. John the Baptist, who appeared instantly before him.¹ He

¹ As Anschar knew them at once, it must be supposed that the saints appeared as usually represented in works of art at that time. St. Peter was the older, with a hoary head, the hair flat and bushy; a ruddy complexion, but rather sad countenance; his dress white, but mingled with colors (*candidâ et coloratâ*); his stature short. The Baptist was young, tall, with a sprouting beard; the hair rather dark and curling; the face emaciated, but

was conducted by his saintly guides to Purgatory, where he passed three days in darkness, and almost suffocation; those days appeared a thousand years. He passed on to heaven, whose inhabitants and their glory he was permitted to behold; and a voice of the most exquisite sweetness, but so clear that it seemed to fill the world, spoke to him out of the unapproachable light, "Go, and return hither, crowned with martyrdom."¹ On this triumphant end, which he gained at last, not by the sword, but by the slow mortification of his life, was thenceforth set the soul of Anschar.

His thoughts had no doubt been already turned towards the conversion of the heathen by his residence in a monastic outpost of Christendom, founded by the zeal of the Corbey monks in a beautiful valley on the west bank of the Weser, east of Paderborn, and called *Æt.* 16, 23. New Corbey.² In this convent he had been appointed to preach to the people, and doubtless prepared himself for his future successes.

When the demand was made at the court of Louis the Pious, among the assembled prelates and nobles, who could be found fit and willing to attend the Christian Harold into his Pagan country, and to risk his life for the propagation of the faith, all were silent, until Wala, the abbot of Corbey, bethought him of Anschar. The monk was summoned, and calmly but resolutely undertook the mission. The abbot inquired whether he acted but in obedience to his superior, or from his own free

the countenance pleasant. He wore a *silken dress*. "Those who wear silk dresses are in kings' chambers!"

¹ The biographer relates this fine vision, as he says, in the words of Anschar himself. *Vit. S. Anscharii* apud Pertz, vol. ii. p. 692.

² It was near the modern Hörter, in Westphalia. It is described by Paschasius Radbertus in his life of Adalhard.—Pertz, ii. p. 531.

will. He modestly persisted in his determination, unshaken by the persuasion of those who loved him, and the reproof of others, who, unable to aspire to the sublimity of his faith, were jealous of his superiority.

A brother of the convent, named Autbert, though of noble birth, was so kindled by the zeal of Anschar, that he resolved to accompany him. Anschar spent two years in Denmark, but over his difficulties and his successes the biographer passes with unsatisfactory rapidity. He formed a school of twelve children. At the end of the two years his companion retired, in the extremity of sickness, to New Corbey, and died.

But whatever the success of Anschar in Denmark, the more remote regions of the North suddenly opened on the zealous missionary. An embassy from Sweden announced that many of that nation were prepared to accept Christianity. Anschar did not hesitate at once to proceed to this more distant and unknown scene of labor. As he crossed the Sound, his ship was attacked by pirates; he escaped with difficulty to the shore, losing all he possessed, especially the precious treasure of forty books. On his arrival in Sweden, the reigning king allowed him full liberty to preach the Gospel. There were many Christian captives in the land, who gladly welcomed a priest who could administer the sacred mysteries of the faith. Anschar, after some time, returned to France; and Gauzbert, a Frankish monk, was sent as Bishop to Sweden.

In the mean time the archbishopric of Hamburg had been founded. Anschar was raised to the see, A.D. 832. and invested with metropolitan power over all the northern missions. But the Northmen had A.D. 837.

as yet learned no respect for Christianity. They surprised Hamburg. Anschar hardly escaped, bearing away nothing but the reliques of the saints ; every thing else, even his library, was burned to ashes.

The prospects of Christianity in Sweden were suddenly darkened. The king had favored the preachers of the Gospel ; the people were still obdurately wedded to their idolatry. An insurrection broke out ; one Christian teacher suffered death ; the Bishop was seized and expelled from the kingdom. For seven years Paganism triumphed without disturbance. Anschar in the mean time had been reinstated in the archiepiscopate, now formed by the union of Hamburg with Bremen. More hopeful intelligence came from Sweden ; it was rumored that all who had been concerned in the insurrection had, in some awful manner, been marked for untimely death : the possessor of a book, which had been taken during the pillage by his son, was more signally visited by the Divine wrath. But either from prudence or timidity, the Bishop Gauzbert represented himself as personally so obnoxious to the hatred of the people, that his presence could but excite more bitter hostility. Anschar did not hesitate to obey the call ; and in the account of this mission appear some curious incidents, characteristic of the versatile Paganism of the country. " If," it was said, " you want a new God, there is your late king, Eric, in whose honor we have lately built a temple." But Anschar, however strongly dissuaded, determined again to try his influence on the Christians' old protector, the king. He invited him to a feast, made him presents ; but the king, become more cautious or more timid, declared that on so great a question he would consult his people

and his gods. True to his word, he first held a private council of his nobles, where it was agreed to consult the gods by lots. The lot was favorable to the acceptance of Christianity; the whole people were then assembled in their parliament; and the herald publicly proclaimed the object of their meeting, the admission or rejection of Christianity. The people were of conflicting opinions. A tumult had almost begun, when an aged man arose, and declared that the God of the Christians had been singularly powerful and propitious, in saving him and others from the perils of the sea, and from pirates. "It would be much wiser, since our own gods are not always so favorable, to have this God also, who is so mighty, and so ready a Protector."¹ This prudent advice carried with it the whole assembly. Christianity was admitted by general consent as a religion permitted by the nation. Churches might be built, and priests allowed to celebrate the mysteries of the faith. On the death of the king, some opposition was at first threatened by his son. His hostility died away; the Christians were even allowed to set up a bell, which seems to have been peculiarly detested by the Swedish Pagans. Once having obtained a footing, Christianity wrought slowly on, till it had achieved the final conversion of the kingdom. But it was not till above a century and a half later, that, under the reign of Canute the Great over the united Christian kingdoms of England and Denmark — were sent over to Denmark English priests and bishops, for the final conversion of his whole continental realm. Canute him-

¹ "Nobis enim quando nostros propitios habere non possumus Deos, bonum est hujus Dei gratiam habere, qui semper in omnibus potest et vult ad se clamantibus auxiliari." — c. xxvii. p. 713.

self bore as it were the homage of his two Teutonic kingdoms to the feet of the Pontiff of Latin Christianity.¹ The tenth century saw the first dawn of Christianity in Norway.

¹ S. Anschar died A.D. 865. Canute king from 1014 to 1055. Canute visited Rome A.D. 1026 or 1027.

CHAPTER X.

ALFRED.

THE Christianity of the age, by this aggrandizement of the sacerdotal order, and by the civil wars among the descendants of Charlemagne, seemed to deliver France, and parts of Germany, almost defenceless into the hands of the Pagan Barbarians. A Christian King rescued one part of Europe, which was in still greater danger, from total subjugation to the heathen Northmen.

Our English Alfred¹ approaches, as near as possible, considering his age, to that lofty model, a Christian Sovereign. Some irregularities in his early youth Alfred were supposed to be chastised by a severe and inexplicable malady, which seized him at the time of his marriage, and afflicted him during twenty years of his life with excruciating suffering. Even his serene temper was exasperated, in the course of the terrific warfare with the Danes, to some acts of more than necessary cruelty and revenge.

The mind of Alfred was deeply impregnated with true Christian faith. As a child he had been twice taken to Rome, but too early, probably, for the majestic sanctity of the holy city to make much impression: yet, no doubt, some vague feeling of reverence must have been left upon his mind by his solemn anointing, as

¹ Alfred was born 849; in Rome, 853 and 855; died, 901.

King of Demetia, by the Pope himself. In his youth he was singularly devout; rose before the cock crew for the religious services; and in all the dangers, the troubles, the perpetual wars, the absorbing cares of government, he never intermitted the daily mass, or any of the prayers or ceremonies of the Church.

The heroism of Alfred's resistance to the Danes was not only that of a patriotic sovereign, enduring every extremity in defence of his country against a foreign foe, but that of a Christian offering an inflexible resistance to Pagans and Barbarians. Religious hope, religious reliance on God, animated him in battle; religious resignation to the divine will sustained him in the depths of adversity. His war against the Danes was a crusade, with all which demands generous sympathy and admiration — nothing which shocks the purer Christian feeling.

Alfred alone rescued England from a total return to Paganism and barbarity; and delayed the Danish conquest till the Northmen had been at least partially conquered, and in some degree softened by Christianity. So nearly was this retrogressive movement achieved; so nearly was the whole island in the possession of these desolating invaders; that the Danes were at once on every coast, and in almost every part of the centre of the island: they are at once burning Lindisfarn, and fighting a great battle in Devonshire. At one time they have possession of Canterbury, Rochester, and London; at other times of Winchester, Exeter, York, Nottingham, Reading, Chippenham in Wiltshire, Cambridge.¹ Their numbers were so magnified by the terrors of the people,

¹ See in Depping the plunder of Croyland, Medhamstead, Ely, and Coldingham, p. 141; Asser, p. 29.

that if 30,000 are reported as killed in one day, they are said to be succeeded the next by double the number. The churches and the monasteries were the chief objects of Danish enmity and spoliation, no doubt, as in France, from their wealth and defencelessness; they were the only places which offered rich and easy booty. Even the religious enthusiasm of the people was cowed, and almost extinct under these incessant persecutions. Its most popular and prevailing impulse, that which, in other countries, had seemed only to grow stronger in times of public calamity, the eagerness for a monastic life, had died away. When Alfred wished to found two monasteries, one for men at Athelney, one for females at Shaftesbury, he found not a single free or noble person disposed to be a monk or nun.¹ He was obliged to assemble them from all orders and all parts — some from beyond the sea, especially from France — there was one Pagan, Asser significantly says, “not the last.”

Alfred felt no security until he had compelled his enemies to Christianity; this was the one end and assurance of victory. The first fruits of his great triumph at Eddington was the baptism of Guthrun with thirty of his chieftains.² This was the only A.D. 879. guarantee for their faith — a precarious guarantee. This alone changed them from fierce and roving marauders to settled inhabitants of the land.

Alfred is no less memorable as preserving the close connexion between Christianity and civilization. It is difficult to understand how, after the long and total

¹ Asser, p. 61. “Nimirum, quia per multa retroacta annorum curricula monasticæ vitæ desiderium ab illâ totâ gente, necnon et a multis aliis gentibus funditus interierat.” Asser, among his reasons, gives one we should scarcely have expected, — the *wealth* of the nation.

² Page 35.

devastation of the kingdom by the Danes, Alfred could erect the buildings, pile up the castles, build the fleets, endow the churches and monasteries, if not schools, and send out the embassies, which might seem to demand more flourishing finances. He divided, it is said, his whole revenue into two parts; one devoted to secular, the other to religious purposes.¹ The latter was subdivided into four; one assigned to the poor, one to his monasteries of Athelney and Shaftesbury, one to the school which he had founded for his nobles, one for the monasteries of the rest of the kingdom, with occasional gifts to foreign religious houses.

Up to twelve years of age, Alfred, the favorite of his parents, and the best hunter in the Court, was ignorant of letters. His mother offered a richly-embellished volume of Saxon poetry to that one of her children who would learn to read it. Alfred, by divine inspiration (writes his biographer), and attracted by the beauty of the capital letters, immediately set about the task and won the prize. The love of letters was thus stamped upon his heart: he constantly carried in his bosom a book of psalms and prayers, which he read himself—a rare accomplishment, almost unrivalled in the whole kingdom of the West Saxons. His youthful prize may have suggested, or urged on him more strongly, the great work of Alfred: his powerful encouragement of the native Saxon literature, the identifica-

¹ Asser relates that when the king gave him the two monasteries of Amesbury and Banwell, he presented him with a silken pallium of great value, and as much incense as a strong man could carry! This must have been a most costly gift!—P. 50. Can we suppose that the Danes having plundered all the religious houses, there was great store of this, to them, useless commodity among the booty which Alfred recovered and could not restore to its lawful owners?

tion of Christianity with the manners, language, poetry, not of a half Roman, but purely Teutonic race. Alfred delighted in all the old Saxon poems; he collected and caused to be recited Saxon books; and so, instead of being the religion of a learned priesthood, the Anglo-Saxon Christianity was familiarized and endeared to the people: it was a popular national faith. The knowledge of Latin, Alfred thought, would rather be promoted than discouraged by the translation of books into the vulgar tongue. It was a work of love in which he labored himself, not only from delight, but from want of assistants. In the whole land south of the Trent, there were few priests who could translate Latin into English; ¹ south of the Thames, at his accession, not one. What is more extraordinary, it was a religion which went back to the pure and primal sources of the faith—the sacred Scriptures. The poetry, the tradition of which Alfred continued from the monk Cædmon, was not a poetry exclusively of legend, of the lives and wonders of the Saints, but of the Sacred History thrown into the language and metre of Saxon poetry. It had its popular saints with their metrical lives; ² but its greatest poets had still reverted to the higher source of inspiration. Alfred, indeed, had not the high poetic gift of the older Cædmon. His works are those of the laborious man of learning, communicating the traditionary treasures of knowledge, which remained from the older civilization, to his Saxon subjects. King Alfred gave to Saxon England the Ecclesiastical History of Bede; the epitome of Augus-

¹ *Præfatio ad Greg. Past.*, in Wise's Alfred, p. 87.

² See, on the poetry of Cædmon, above. Mr. Thorpe, in his curious volume from the Exeter Code, has a long poetical life of St. Guthlak, another of St. Juliana

tine's great works by Orosius. He gave them the Consolation of Boëthius, and the Pastoral of St. Gregory. He summoned from all quarters men of learning. Asser came from St. David's, John of Saxony from the Abbey of Corbey ; Archbishop Hincmar, of Rheims, sent Grimbald, Provost of St. Omer. The University of Oxford boasts, but on very doubtful authority, to owe her foundation to Alfred the Great.¹

¹ Compare Lingard, i. p. 179. •

CHAPTER XI.

THE HUNGARIANS. DEGRADATION OF THE PAPACY.

IN the tenth century the few reflecting minds might not without reason apprehend the approaching dissolution of the world. A vast anarchy ^{Tenth century.} seemed to spread over Western Christendom. It is perhaps the darkest period in the history of every country in Europe. The Pagan Magyars, more terrible even than the Islamite Saracens, and the Pagan Northmen, now burst upon Europe. The ^{The Hungarians.} Arabs, who had swarmed from their deserts, wild marauders, had long become disciplined armies: Islam had become a mighty empire. The Caliphate maintained the show at least of ascendancy over the Sultanies of Africa and of Spain. Arabic was the language of whole regions, almost of continents. The Northmen, fierce pirates as they were, were of origin kindred to the Teutonic conquerors of France. Both Saracens and Northmen acknowledged some rude laws of war. But the Magyars, or Hungarians, seemed as hordes of savages or of wild beasts let loose upon mankind.¹ They burst unexpectedly upon Christendom in swarms of which the source seemed unknown and inexhaustible. Indiscriminate massacre seemed their only war law; they were bound by no treaties, respected no

¹ Gibbon, ch. lv. vol. x. pp. 193-209.

boundaries. Civilization, Christianity, withered before their hosts, who were magnified by panic into misshapen monsters, and cannibals who fed on human flesh. Their language, of the Finnish stock, was akin to no known tongue. In those days of disorder and anarchy in Christendom, it is almost incredible that a single race, even if it swept with them many of the tribes who lay on the borders of civilization, Slavians and Bulgarians, could have so completely covered Europe, as to range over the whole of Germany; burn nearly at the same time, Bremen on the Baltic, and the monastery of St. Gall, near the lake of Constance; overrun Southern France, and menace the kingdoms beyond the Pyrenees. They rushed down the Alps, Italy lay open before them. Splendid Pavia, with its forty-three churches, was in ashes. Everywhere the walls of the cities were hastily repaired. Special litanies resounded in all the churches of Italy which escaped their ravages, for protection against the Hungarians. Rome beheld at no great distance the flame of their devastation; they spread to the very extremity of the peninsula.¹ The Hungarians for half a century were the common terror of Christendom, from their first irruption about A.D. 884, to A.D. 936, the date of the first great victory of Henry the Fowler. Gradually the Magyars settled down on the limits of modern Hungary. At the beginning of the next century Christian-

¹ The Chronic. Wurz. sub ann. 938, sums up their ravages: "Ungarii Franciam, Alemanniam, Galliam, usque oceanum et Burgundiam devastantes per Italiam redierunt, monasteria S. Galli et S. Bonifacii cremantur." The chronicles of almost every monastery — and a great number of monasteries in all quarters had their chronicle — record the losses, ruin, and desolation inflicted by these terrible strangers. — Apud Pertz, ii. p. 241, &c. Compare Liutprand, Lib. ii. in init. One of Muratori's dissertations describes their ravages in Italy.

ity had entirely subdued them, and with a kind of prophetic wisdom had arrayed this valiant nation as a future outguard against the Mohammedan Turks; their **King Stephen was a Saint.**

Cast a rapid glance over Christendom during these disastrous invasions of Saracens, Normans, Hungarians.

In England, though the wise institutions of Alfred, and now and then a king, like Athelstan, of State of Western Christendom, more commanding character, maintained some England. social order, almost the whole period was an uninterrupted war with the Danes. The Church was distracted by the implacable contests between the secular and regular clergy. In France the Carlovingian race was expiring, almost in the same state of imbecility and powerlessness as the Merovingians whom they supplanted. Towards the close of this period the new race of the Capets rose to the throne, the first purely French Dynasty. The Normans were now in settled possession of a great province in the kingdom.

The Empire alone displayed occasional vigor, rather from the commanding character of Henry Germany. the Fowler, the first conqueror of the Magyars, of Otho the Great and his descendants, than from the Imperial power itself. The legitimate descent from Charlemagne had expired in Louis III., the illegitimate in Arnulf. The imperial crown had passed from Italy, and back to Germany. It had become an Elective Sovereignty, as yet with no established rule or form of election, and had been for a short time absolutely suspended: it resumed its greatness under the House of Saxony.

But the deepest abasement, or rather almost annihilation, had already fallen on the Papacy. It- Abasement of the Papacy ally, which for a time pretended to the Empire,

without a native prince of sufficient power or dignity to maintain its influence, constantly summoning new sovereigns from beyond the Alps to assume that perilous honor, until the right of election was resumed by Germany, was one battle-field of small contending princes, each endeavoring to form or to aggrandize an hereditary principality. The terror of the Hungarians increased at once the confusion, and, by compelling the more strong and artificial fortification of the cities, tended to their more complete isolation. Each city became an independent government; each chieftain aspired to be a sovereign. This anarchy of Italy led to the degradation of the Papacy, the degradation of the Papacy increased the anarchy of Italy. So insignificant is the Pope become, that it is almost as difficult to trace now for a long period, as afterwards at the close of the century, the regular succession. The Pope steals unnoticed into his dignity, and departs from it as unregarded; or rather is suddenly thrust into the throne by some act of violence, and as suddenly dispossessed by means as violent.

To none in the Christian world seems to have occurred the extraordinary anomaly, the election of a spiritual monarch for Christendom (for so he was esteemed in the West) by a body neither in character nor in general esteem representing the community. A single city aspired to nominate the universal Bishop; but that city was Rome; and Europe was resolutely ignorant what strange accidents, caprices, crimes, intrigues, even assassinations determined the rise and fall of the Supreme Pontiff. It is a memorable instance of the vital power of names, that the Christian world so long assented, without protest, apparently

Undetermined form
of election.

without consciousness of wrong, to the pretensions not only of the clergy but of the nobles and people of Rome, and whatever soldiery, either Roman or foreign, might command the city, to be the electors of the spiritual autocrat. The assent of the Emperor, at first of the East through the Exarch of Ravenna, afterwards of Charlemagne and his descendants (in theory at least esteemed necessary for the consecration of the Supreme Pontiff), had given to the world, or rather to Latin Christendom, some control over, at least some concurrence in, the election. But the Empire itself was now in abeyance. Italy now asserted her independence, forming a separate political system, with an elective king, and a number of dukes, counts, and princes, who recognized only when forcibly compelled, the supreme authority. At this inauspicious time the absolute election of the Pope reverted to this ill-organized democracy, or, as it were, to these conflicting democracies. Whoever now obtained the mastery of Rome by any means of violence, intrigue, or faction, the neighboring prince, the demagogue, the rude soldier, or the daring woman, nominated the head of Christendom. The Pope was himself one of those violent or licentious men, or an insignificant personage only performing the religious functions of his office, and holding his office, even his life, at the will of this shifting but perpetual tyranny.

On the other hand, the authority of the Pope, if not in the nomination — in the coronation of the Emperor — if it entangled him too inextricably in secular affairs, had given great dignity to his position. This continued so long as the Empire passed in a direct line down the descendants of Charlemagne. But even already, as

soon as the claim had come to be contested, the Pope, with not power enough to be the arbiter, sank into the partisan of one of the contending factions. Rome, become the centre of this strife, added to her own conflicting parties, that of rival Kings struggling for the Empire. Already the Pope had to choose between the dynasties of France and Germany or Italy. Each interest maintained its hired or devoted partisans in Rome, either thwarting or urging the Pope to hostile measures against its adversaries; at the time of each election to the Popedom exciting or maddening the contest. The Papal throne, even before it had assumed the power of awarding thrones and dictating to mankind, had been an object of fierce, or at times of sanguinary strife; and all these foreign and political influences exasperated the wild collision of personal conflict. While all around were lawless chieftains, ready to interfere with or without cause, to espouse any interest, and to aggrandize or enrich themselves at the expense of the metropolis of Christendom.

This iron age, as it has been called, opened with the Pontificate of Benedict IV.,¹ the successor of John IX. The only act recorded of Benedict IV., was the coronation² of the unfortunate Louis of Provence, the competitor of Berengar for the empire. Louis according to Imperial usage, set up his tribunal, and adjudged causes at Rome.

On the death of Benedict, the prudent precautions established by John IX., to introduce some regularity and control over the anarchy of an election by a clergy rent into factions, by a lawless nobility, and still more

¹ July, A.D. 900; died, 903, Aug.

² 901, Feb. Boehmer, regesta.

lawless people, during this utter helplessness and the abeyance, or the strife for the empire between rival princes, fell into utter neglect, or impotency. The Papacy became the prize of the most active, daring, and violent. Leo V. won the prize; before A.D. 903. two months he was ejected and thrown into prison¹ by Christopher, one of his own presbyters and chaplains. The same year, or early in the next, Christopher was in his turn ignominiously driven from Rome.

Sergius had already once if not twice, at the accession of John IX.,² or at that of Formosus, or at both periods, contested the Papal chair. On his discomfiture he had taken refuge at the Court of the powerful counts of Tuscany; and there sat watching, with a band of devoted partisans, the rapid revolutions in Rome.

This great marquisate, or county of Tuscany, which for a long period exercised so vast an influence for evil or for good, had gradually risen to its enormous power and wealth: power which for many years ruled Rome and the Papacy; wealth which at length, through the munificence of the celebrated Countess Matilda, its descendant through another line, was hereafter to be the strength and support of the Popes in the days of their most exorbitant authority.

The descent of these hereditary Counts of Lucca, and Marquises or Dukes of Tuscany, is clearly traced from Boniface, who held that rank during the later years of Charlemagne. Adalbert was the grandson of Boniface, through a father of the same name. Adalbert

¹ "Emigrat ante suum quam luna bis impleat orbem."

Flodoard, de Pontif. Rom. apud Mabillon, Acta S. S. Benedict

² "Culmen apostolicæ sedis is jure paterno

Electus tenuit, ut Theodorus oblit,

Joannes subit."

Epitaph in Pagi, sub ann. 910.

had been among those powerful princes, whose claims to beneficiary rights had excited the jealous resentment of the Emperor Louis the Pious. He had been imprisoned, and though soon released, had sworn to avenge the indignity on the first opportunity. Adalbert II., the son of Adalbert I., was so surpassingly wealthy (and wealth in those times was power) that he was called the Rich. His influence, as well as his ambition, was increased by his marriage with Bertha, daughter of the King Lothair, by his wife or concubine, Waldrada, and widow of the King of Provence. This haughty woman was
A.D. 900. mother, by her first husband, of Hugh of Provence, afterwards King of Italy, and Emperor. The counsels of his imperious wife led Adalbert into a premature rebellion against Lambert, then Emperor, and King of Italy. The Tuscan was defeated ignominiously, and thrown into prison. He had been taken in a stable.¹ Lambert insulted him by saying, "Your haughty wife Bertha prophesied that you would be a king or an ass; lo, you are found like an ass in the stalls among the cattle!" The death of Lambert, by accident or assassination, released Adalbert from his captivity, and restored him to his power. From this time the fate of Italy seemed to depend upon his will. The fickle Italians, weary of the rule of Berengar, who on the death of Lambert had become undisputed pos-
A.D. 900. sessor of the empire, invited Louis of Provence, the son of Count Boso, and Ermengard, daughter of the Emperor Louis of Germany, to assume the throne of Italy and the empire. Adalbert at first maintained the cause of Berengar (his fidelity was secured by ample gifts), and Louis was obliged to retreat beyond the Alps.

¹ Liutprand, ii. 33.

But the ambitious Bertha alienated the mind of her husband from Berengar.¹ Adalbert joined in a second invitation to Louis. Berengar, when he found the Tuscans among his enemies, shut himself up in Verona, which he was obliged to surrender to the victorious Louis. The new Emperor and King of Italy was crowned in Rome.² On his return he visited Lucca, where the indiscreet Emperor beheld with astonishment, alarm, and envy, the state, and the formidable and well-appointed forces of Adalbert. He dropped the incautious expression, "This is no marquis, but a king." From that moment the throne of Louis was lost. Bertha organized an extensive revolt of the Italian provinces. Louis allowed himself to be surprised in Verona by Berengar, who revenged himself by putting out the eyes of his rival.

It was under the protection of this powerful Tuscan that the exiled Sergius, at the head of a strong force of Tuscan soldiers, appeared in Rome, deposed Christopher,³ who had just deposed Leo V., and took possession of the Papal throne.

Sergius had been seven years an exile in A.D. 897-904. Tuscany; for seven years he ruled as supreme, but not undisputed, Pontiff. This Pope has been A.D. 904-911. loaded with every vice and every enormity which can blacken the character of man.⁴ Yet as to his reign

¹ "Bellus Tyrrhenis fundens fera sibila ab oris
Solicitat Rhodani gentem."

Panegy. Berengar. iv.

901. I follow Muratori's course of events.

² Christopher consecrated Oct. 903; deposed, and becomes a monk, Jan. 904.

⁴ "Sergius inde redit, dudum, qui lectus ad arcem
Culminis, exsilio tulerat rapiente repulsam,
Quo profugus latuit Septem volventibus annis.
Hinc populi remeans precibus sacratur honore

there is almost total obscurity. The only certain act which has transpired is his restoration of the Lateran palace, which had fallen into ruins; an act which indicates a period of comparative peace and orderly administration, with the command of a large revenue.¹ In these violent times Sergius probably scrupled at no violence; but if he drove a Pope from the throne of St. Peter, that Pope had just before deposed his patron, and with great cruelty.²

But during the Papacy of Sergius rose into power the infamous Theodora, with her daughters Marozia and Theodora, the prostitutes who, in the strong language of historians, disposed for many years of the Papal tiara, and not content with disgracing by their own licentious lives the chief city of Christendom, actually placed their profligate paramours or base-born sons in the chair of St. Peter. The influence obtained by Theodora and her daughters, if it shows not the criminal connivance of Pope Sergius, or a still more disgraceful connection with which he was charged by the scandal of the times, proves at least the utter degradation of the Papal power in Rome. It had not only lost all commanding authority, but could not even maintain outward decency. Theodora was born of a noble and wealthy senatorial family, on whom she has entailed an infamous immortality. The women of Rome seem at successive periods seized with a kind of Roman ambi-

Pridem adsignato, quo nomine Tertius exit
Antistes, Petri eximiâ quo cede recepto
Præsule gaudet ovans annis Septem amplius orbis."

Flodoard de Rom. Pontif.

¹ Mabillon, in Appendic. ad Ord. Roman. Muratori, sub ann. 907.

² See also the epitaph on Sergius apud Muratori, A.D. 911. Yet even Sergius is regulating the affairs and granting the pallium to an archbishop of Hamburg. — Jaffé, *Regesta*, p. 308.

tion to surpass their sex by the greatness of their virtues and of their vices. These females were to the Paulas and Eustochiums of the younger and severer age of Roman Christianity, what the Julias and Messalinas of the Empire were to the Volumnias and Cornelias of the Republic.¹

It must be acknowledged, that if the stern language of Tacitus and Juvenal may have darkened the vices of the queens and daughters of the Cæsars, the Bishop of Cremona, our chief authority on the enormities of Theodora and her daughters, wants the moral dignity, while he is liable to the same suspicion as those great writers. Throughout the lives of the Pontiffs themselves we have to balance between the malignant license of satire and the unmeaning phrases of adulatory panegyric.² On the other hand it is difficult to decide which is more utterly unchristian: the profound hatred which

¹ The devout indignation of Baronius, as to these times, arose no doubt in great part from the severe but honest asceticism of his character, and his horror at this violation of his high notions of sacerdotal sanctity by what appeared to him far more unseemly and unpardonable criminality than arrogance, avarice, or cruelty. His fears, too, lest he should be accused of an immoral partiality by the slightest extenuation, or even by a dispassionate examination of such vices, has led him to exaggerate rather than soften the monstrous enormities of those times. And the happy thought, happy in a thorough-going controversialist, that the deeper the degradation of the Papacy, the more wonderful, and therefore the more manifestly of God, its restoration to power, removed every remaining repugnance to his abandonment of all the popes during the tenth century to historical infamy. The passage is too well known and too long for citation. Muratori, who had some new authorities, is more temperate, especially as to the character of Sergius.

² Liutprand is the chief, the only authority on which Baronius rests. Muratori inclines to the Panegyrist of Berengarius, who gives a high character of John X., and to Flodoard: but the poet's language consists merely of the common phrases applied to all popes, who are, according to some writers, ex officio endowed with certain virtues. and Pope John had just acknowledged the title, and entered into close alliance with the object of the poet's panegyric.

could invent or accredit such stories; the utter dissoluteness which made them easily believed; or the actual truth of such charges.

Liutprand relates that John, afterwards the tenth Pope of that name, being employed in Rome on some ecclesiastical matters by the Archbishop of Ravenna, was the paramour of Theodora,¹ who not only allowed, but compelled him to her embraces. John X. was first appointed to the see of Bologna; but the archbishopric of Ravenna, the second ecclesiastical dignity in Italy, falling vacant before he had been consecrated, he was advanced by the same dominant influence to that see.² But Theodora bore with impatience the separation of two hundred miles from her lover.

Anastasius III. had succeeded Sergius, and occupied the Papacy for rather more than two years; after him Lando for six months. On the death of Lando, by a more flagrant violation of the canonical rule than that charged against the dead body of Formosus, John was translated from the archiepiscopate of Ravenna to the see of Rome. But Theodora, if she indeed possessed this dictatorial

Sept. 911.
Nov 913.
May, 914.

John X.
May 15, 914.

¹ "Theodora, . . . quod dictu etiam fœdissimum est, Romanæ civitatis non inviriliter monarchiam obtinebat." — Liutprand.

² Muratori has suggested a most serious objection to the story of Liutprand. That author says that the translation of John from Ravenna to Rome took place "modicâ temporis intercapedine," after his appointment to Ravenna. There is strong evidence for supposing John to have been Archbishop of Ravenna from 905 to 914, a long period for such a passion as Theodora's to endure delay. Are we to suppose that, though Archbishop of Ravenna, he resided at Rome? "Joannes Archiepiscopus Ravennatis ecclesiæ, incitatus a primatibus Romanæ urbis, contra instituta canonum, agens, Romanæ ecclesiæ invasor factus." — *Chron. S. Benedict. apud Pertz. Compare Chron. Mon. Cass. apud Pertz, Liutprand. "Theodoræ autem glycerii mens perversa, Ravennatem hunc præsulatum coegit deserere, Romanumque, pro nefas! summum pontificium usurpare."* — c. 48.

power, and the clergy and people of Rome, if they yielded to her dictation, may have been actuated by nobler and better motives than her gratification of a lustful passion, if not by motives purely Christian. For however the Archbishop of Ravenna might be no example of piety or holiness as the spiritual head of Christendom, he appears to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office. He was a man of ability and daring, eminently wanting at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest. The Saracens occupied a strong fortress on the Garigliano,¹ which, while it secured their own southern conquests, constantly threatened the dukedoms beyond their border. The whole domain or territory of St. Peter lay at their mercy. They commanded, and could interrupt almost all communication with the South of Italy. The pilgrims could not reach the shrines of the apostles without being plundered, maltreated, often made prisoners, and obliged to ransom themselves at enormous prices.

The Pontiff placed himself at the head of a powerful confederacy of the neighboring dukes, who were either awed or persuaded into a league for mutual defence: it comprehended Landulf, the Duke of Benevento and Capua, the Dukes of Spoleto and Camerina. But a stronger effort was necessary. It was determined to demand the aid of the two Emperors, those of the West and of the East, in the common cause of Christendom. Constantine, the Emperor of the East, promised naval succors. Berengar was now undisputed Emperor of the West; he

March 24. 916.
Coronation of
the Emperor
Berengar.

¹ The poet calls this fortress the "vicina Charybdis," which swallowed up all the wealth of Rome. — De Laudib. Berengar.

accepted the invitation, and went in person to Rome. His poetical panegyrist has left a glowing description of his power, and the magnificence of his reception. He was met by the Senate with their banners, which represented the heads of wild beasts. They sang his praises in their Latin or Italian tongue. The Senate was followed by the schools of strangers, the Greek among the rest, who each paid their homage to the Emperor in their native dialect. The nobles were represented by Peter, the brother of the Pope, and the son of Theophylact, called by the poet the Consul of Rome. The Popes were accustomed to receive the Emperors standing on the top of the steps leading up to St. Peter's. Latterly they had assumed the more dignified attitude of remaining seated. The Emperor rode the Pope's white horse, according to usage.¹ He ascended the steps, was received and saluted by the Pope with a kiss. After the Emperor had sworn to maintain the privileges and possessions of the Church, they entered the church hand in hand, the Pope chanting the service. The Emperor knelt and worshipped at the tomb of St. Peter, and was afterwards received at a splendid banquet by the Pope. The coronation and anointing took place the day after Easter-day. The donations of Pepin and Charlemagne were read, with all the domains granted to the successor of St. Peter, as a warning lest any robber should presume to usurp those sacred lands.² But the Pope was

¹ "Evectus Pastoris equo, mox quippe sacerdos
Ipse futurus erat, titulo res digna perenni."

See the note of Valesius. There seems to have been some symbolical meaning which is far from clear. Does it imply that the Emperor, by being anointed, assumed a sacerdotal character?

² "Lectitat Augusti concessos munere pagos,
Præsulis obsequio gradibus stans lector in altis,
Cæsare quo norint omnes data munera, prædo
Ulterius paveat sacras sibi sumere terras"

not content with his legitimate influence, in organizing this great league for the preservation, if not of Christendom, at least of Rome, from the unbelievers. He placed himself at the head of the army, and for the first time the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of the Prince of Peace, rode forth in his array to battle. And, if success, as it doubtless was, might be interpreted as a manifestation of Divine approval, the total discomfiture of the Saracens, and the destruction of the troublesome fortress on the Garigliano, seemed to sanction Aug. 11, 916. this new and unseemly character assumed by the Pope. Even the Apostles sanctioned or secured by their presence the triumph of the warlike Pope.¹

For fourteen years, obscure as regards Rome and the Pontificate, this powerful prelate occupied the A.D. 914-928. See of Rome. If he gained it (a doubtful charge) by the vices and influence of the mother, Theodora, he lost it, together with his life, by the no less flagrant vices, and more monstrous power, of the daughter, Marozia.

Theodora disappears; and Pope John X. is found engaged in a fierce contest for the mastery of Rome with Marozia and her lover or husband, the

Marquis Alberic,² by whom she had a son of the same name, afterwards tyrant of the city. The vigorous and martial Pontiff succeeds in expelling Alberic from the city; Alberic probably met his death soon A.D. 925. after. It is said that he was murdered by the Romans

¹ "A religiosis fidelibus visi sunt in eodem bello sanctissimi Petrus et Paulus apostoli." — Liutprand, c. 54.

² Muratori has clearly proved the mistake, or perhaps false reading, in Liutprand, followed by Baronius and others. The lover of Marozia was not and could not be Adalbert the Rich, the Duke of Tuscany, the husband of the imperious Bertha, and the protector of Sergius. Adalbert does not seem to have been at Rome. The lover of Marozia was Alberic, Marquis (Marchio) perhaps of Camerina.

in revenge for some secret alliance entered into with the Hungarians, who were then wasting Italy, and had reached the very frontiers of Calabria.

The death of her husband increased rather than weakened the power of Marozia. Her personal charms, and her unscrupulous use of them, are said to have multiplied to an infinite extent her adherents. Her paramours made a strong party. The Empire was vacant. There was no potentate to whom the Pope could appeal. Marozia seized the castle of St. Angelo, and with this precious dowry, which commanded Rome, she sought to confirm her power by some splendid alliance. Guido, the Duke of Tuscany, the son of Adalbert the Marquis, did not disdain the nuptials with a profligate woman, who brought Rome as her marriage portion.

During the rapid and bloody revolutions of the few last years in Italy, this house of Tuscany had maintained its greatness. Soon after the death of Adalbert the Rich, the widow Bertha, and Guido her son, plunged into their quarrel with the Emperor Berengar, then at the height of his power; they had been imprisoned, but speedily obtained their release, and recovered all their wealth and power. Bertha had extended her influence by the marriage of her daughter, Ermen-gard, a woman of unprincipled ambition, worthy of her mother, with Adalbert, the Marquis of Ivrea, whose first wife had been a daughter of the Emperor Berengar, and who was the most powerful of the northern princes.

The murder of Berengar (who died unpitied,¹ for in
A.D. 922. his last contest with the new usurper of the

¹ Liutprand, c. 61.

empire, Rodolf of Burgundy, he had made a treaty with the terrible Hungarians, now the scourge of the North, as the Saracens were of the South) had made the empire vacant, and threw the whole north of Italy into the utmost confusion. Ermengard, now a widow, and if Liutprand is to be credited, of unscrupulous license, not with princes only, but even with ignoble men,¹ became the object and the promotress of all the intrigues, feuds, and murders, on account of the kingdom of Italy.

The strife ended with the descent into Italy of Hugh of Provence, the son of Bertha by her first husband, and so half brother to Guido of Hugh of Provence. Tuscany. Hugh of Provence, the new competitor for the kingdom of Italy and the Empire, landed at Pisa. This crafty Prince fully estimated the influence of the clergy in the politics of Italy. He affected the most profound zeal for religion. He was a man, for his day, of many accomplishments, and sought the society of those whom Liutprand dignifies by the name of philosophers. Liutprand himself, the future historian, ambassador at Constantinople and Bishop of Cremona, was brought up as a page in the court of Hugh of Provence; and though his unbounded licentiousness as to women could not but offend the pious ecclesiastic, the courtly historian touches with great tenderness the other vices, not by any means the lightest, of his royal patron.

The clergy of Italy, flattered by the homage, hailed the landing of Hugh at Pisa, as the restoration of an age of peace and piety. Lanthbert, Archbishop of Milan, was his ardent partisan, and hastened to meet him

¹ "Carnale cum non solum principibus, verum etiam ignobilibus, commercium exercebat." — iii. 7.

at Pavia. The Pope himself, notwithstanding the connexion of Hugh with the husband of Marozia, hoped, perhaps, with the prize of the Imperial crown, to secure his protection against his domestic tyrants. He went July 19, 926. to meet the king at Mantua: a treaty was entered into, but the conditions are unknown.

The last hopes, however, of foreign protection were vain. John X. was left to contest alone the government of Rome with Marozia and her Tuscan husband. Neither Rome, nor the mistress of Rome, regarded the real services rendered by John X. to Christendom and to Italy. The former lover, as public scandal averred, of her mother, the saviour of Rome from the Saracens, was surprised in the Lateran palace by this daring woman. His brother Peter, as it appears, his great support in the contest for the government of Rome, and therefore the object of peculiar hatred to Guido and Marozia, was killed before his face. The Pope was thrown into prison, where some months after he died, either of anguish and despair, or by more summary means. It was rumored that he was smothered with a pillow. No means were too violent for Marozia to employ even against a Pope.¹

Death of
John X.

A.D. 928.

A.D. 929.

Marozia did not venture at once to place her son on the Papal throne. A Leo VI. was Pope for some months; a Stephen VII. for two years and one month. That son may as yet have been too young even for this shameless woman to advance him to the highest ecclesiastical dignity; her husband Guido may have had some lingering respect for the sacred

July, 928.
Feb. 929.
March, 931.

¹ Flodoard, Annal. 929; Liutprand, iii. 43; Annal. Benevent. "Moritur Papa Johannes in castro jugulatus."

office, some struggling feelings of decency. But at the death of Stephen, Marozia again ruled alone in Rome ; her husband Guido was dead, and her son was March, 931.

Pope. John XI. (according to the rumors of the time, of which Liutprand, a follower of Hugh of Provence, may be accepted as a faithful reporter) was the offspring of Marozia by the Pope Sergius : more trustworthy authorities make him the lawful son of her husband Alberic. But the obsequious clergy and people acquiesced without resistance in the commands of their patrician mistress ; the son of Marozia is successor of St. Peter.

But the aspiring Marozia, not content with having been the wife of a Marquis, the wife of the wealthy and powerful Duke of Tuscany ; perhaps the mistress of one, certainly the mother of another Pope, looked still higher in her lustful ambition ; she must wed a monarch. She sent to offer herself and the city of Rome to the new King of Italy.

Hugh of Provence was not scrupulous in his amours, lawful or unlawful. Through policy or through passion, he was always ready to form or to break these tender connections.

Marriage of
Marozia with
Hugh of Pro-
vence.

Yet there was an impediment, a canonical impediment, to this marriage, which even Hugh and Marozia dared not despise. Guido, the late husband of Marozia, and Hugh of Provence, were sons of the same mother. Even the Levitical law, which seems to have occurred to some, would not assist them,¹ for Marozia had borne

¹ Liutprand interlards his history with verses :—

"Hæc tibi Moyseos non præstant carmina vates
Qui fratri sobolem fratris de nomine jussit
Edere, si primus nequeat sibi gignere natum,
Nostra tuo peperisse viro te sæcula norunt,
Respondes scio, tu, sed non Venus ebria curat."

children to Guido.¹ Hugh struck out a happy expedient, at the same time to get over this difficulty, to be master of Rome, and to enable himself to fulfil the other great object of his ambition, the seizure of the Tuscan Dukedom. Truth, justice, and the interests of her late husband's family, were alike insignificant in the eyes of Marozia. Lambert, a man of courage and character, had succeeded his brother Guido in the dukedom. Hugh of Provence began by disseminating rumors that Bertha had no children by her husband Adalbert; that Guido, Lambert, and Ermengard, were all supposititious, and imposed on the weak Adalbert by his crafty wife as his own. Lambert had adopted that last strange resource, so imposing and convincing in those days, in order to vindicate his father's wisdom, his mother's honor, and his own legitimacy. He offered the wager of battle to any champion appointed by the King of Italy. A brave and youthful warrior was chosen. Lambert came off victorious. Foiled in this attempt, King Hugh contrived to seize Lambert by treachery, and to put out his eyes. The rich inheritance and the power of Tuscany passed without resistance to Boso, brother of Hugh. Successful crime made Hugh of Provence only more welcome to Marozia. The King of Italy drew near to Rome: the cautious Marozia would not allow his army to enter the city, but received her royal bridegroom in the castle of St. Angelo. There was celebrated this unhallowed marriage.²

¹ These children probably died early; nothing is heard of them.

² "Advenit optatus ceu bos tibi ductus ad aram
Rex Hugo, Romanam potius commotus ob urbem,
Quid juvat, o scelerata, virum sic perdere sanctum."

The sanctity of King Hugo! The naïveté of Liutprand is truly comic, betraying the motive, the possession of Rome, for this sacrifice!

But the Romans would brook the dominion of a Roman woman, they would not endure that of a foreigner. The coarse vices, the gluttony of the soldiers of Hugh, offended the fastidious Italians. The insolence of Hugh himself provoked a rebellion. The nobles were called upon to perform menial offices, usual probably in the half-feudal ^{Rebellion of Rome.} Transalpine courts, but alien to Italian manners. Alberic, the son of Marozia, was commanded to hold the water in which King Hugh washed his hands. Performing his office awkwardly or reluctantly, he spilled the water, and received a blow on the face from the king. Already may Alberic have been jealous of the promotion of his brother to the popedom, and have resented this devotion of his mother to her new foreign connections. He was a youth of daring; he organized a conspiracy among the nobles of Rome; he appealed to the old Roman pride, — “Shall these Burgundians, of old the slaves of Rome, tyrannize over Romans?”¹ At the tolling of the bell the whole people flocked to his banner, and attacked the castle of St. Angelo before Hugh could admit his own troops. Alberic remained master of the Castle, of his mother, and of the Pope. These two he cast into prison, defied the king of Italy, who made an ignominious retreat, and from that time remained master of Rome.²

For four years Pope John XI. lingered in fact a prisoner, at least without any share in the government

¹ Liutprand. This loose writer, and Flodoard, whose adulatory phrases on the virtues and wisdom of each successive pope remind us of the proverbial mendacity of epitaphs, are still almost our sole authorities.

² Flodoard, in Chron. apud Duchesne.

of Rome, only permitted to perform his spiritual functions. Alberic ruled undisturbed. King Hugh attempted to bribe him to the surrender of Rome, by the offer of his daughter in marriage; the more crafty Alberic married the daughter, and retained possession of Rome. After the death of John, a succession of Popes, appointed, no doubt, by the sole will of Alberic, — Leo VII., Stephen IX., Marinus II., Agapetus II., pass over the throne of the Popedom, with hardly a sign of their power in Rome, no indication of their dignity, still less of their sanctity. They are still Popes beyond the Alps.¹

Papal succession.

Leo, Jan. 936.

Stephen, 939.

Marinus, 941.

Agapetus, 946-956.

Nor was the supreme Pontiff alone depressed in these turbulent times. The great ecclesiastics of Italy are mingled up in most of the treacherous and bloody transactions of the period.² Individual energy gave the bishop of a city great power; but as they acted with as little restraint, so these prelates were treated with as little reverence as secular princes. Landulf of Capua, and Athanasius of Naples, have already appeared in that strangely mingled character of the lawless Italian prince and the Christian prelate. Lanthbert had bought the archbishopric of Milan, by large bribes, from the Emperor

Great ecclesiastics of Italy.

¹ Leo sends a bull to the Archbishop of Hamburg; appoints the Archbishop of Mentz his legate, with full power to correct bishops and monks; makes grants and issues laws. — *Regesta apud Jaffé*. Stephen interferences in France in favor of Louis d'Outre-mer. Marinus confirms the Archbishop of Mentz as his vicar. Agapetus, in a Council, condemns Hugh, Archbishop of Rheims.

² The obscenities which perpetually occur in the pages of the Bishop Liutprand betoken an age of profound corruption. The Italian character was now a strange fusion of lust and ferocity. The emasculation of their enemies was a common revenge.

Berengar. It was by his instrumentality that Burchard, Duke of Suabia, the father-in-law of King Rodolf of Burgundy, was surprised and murdered. Burchard, indeed, had given provocation; he had threatened to turn a church in the suburbs into a fortress, by which he would bridle the mutinous city of Milan.¹

Hugh of Provence, now undisputed King of Italy, though ejected from and baffled before Rome, ruled supreme in Pavia, where he built a splendid palace. Hugh, throughout his reign, showed the utmost scorn of ecclesiastical as of moral control. He had violated the law of marriage by his union with Marozia; as soon as he found it convenient he declared that marriage null, and married Alda, the daughter of King Lothair. On her death he again wedded Bertha, widow A.D. 938. of King Rodolf of Burgundy, and in contempt of the canon law, united her daughter to his son. No stern or ascetic prelate ventured to rebuke the promiscuous concubinage with which the King of Italy still further outraged public decency. He bestowed the great bishoprics according to his caprice. One of his bastards he made Bishop of Piacenza, another Archdeacon, or one of the Cardinals, with the hope of succession to the archbishopric of Milan.² Hilduin, his relation, expelled from his see in France, was raised to the archbishopric of Milan. Ratherius, a French monk, on account of his skill in the seven liberal arts, was made

¹ Compare Verri, *Storia di Milano*, c. iii. p. 99, for the insulting language of Burchard, whom the Archbishop had honored with the especial privilege of allowing him to hunt a stag in his park. Burchard expressed at once his admiration and contempt at the height and strength of the walls of Milan.

² Liutprand, iv. 6. Teobaldo, his bastard by Stephania, a Roman concubine of King Hugh. Verri, p. 101. Hugh formed a plot for the murder of Alderic, the Archbishop; it was baffled.

Bishop of Verona ; this was contrary to the inclination of Hugh, who declared that Ratherius should bitterly lament his elevation. He cut him off with a very small stipend, and forced him to take an oath not to lay claim to any more of the revenues of the Church.¹ On the seizure of Verona by Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, who aspired for a short time to the empire, Ratherius, accused of favoring the usurper, was seized, deposed, and imprisoned at Pavia. Manasseh, Archbishop of Arles, the ungrateful favorite of Hugh, had been permitted to swallow up the bishoprics of Trent, Verona, and Mantua. This ambitious prelate, tempted by the higher offer of the archbishopric of Milan,² on the first opportunity, sought to betray his patron. He was master of the March of Trent, and, as Bishop, commanded the pass of the Alps. This pass he surrendered to Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, when he rose to supplant King Hugh in the dominion of Italy. Monasticism too was now at its lowest ebb. King Hugh granted the lands of abbeys, and even abbeys, like other lands, to his flatterers or his servants.³

Italy, which was soon weary of better kings, began to take steps for relieving herself of the oppressions of King Hugh. Conspiracies were formed with Transalpine sovereigns to contest the kingdom of Italy, first with Rodolf of Burgundy, whom Hugh

Conspiracy
against King
Hugh.

¹ The writings of Ratherius in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* i. and in Martene and Durand, are full of curious matter on his personal history and the state of the Church. He is strong against the universal marriage of the clergy, which he brands as adultery. D'Achery, i. 363.

² Quum miles esse inciperet, episcopus esse desinit. Thus writes Liutprand of Manasseh. Manasseh, in justification of his promotions, had profanely quoted to Liutprand the translation of St. Peter from Antioch to Rome. Liutprand, iii. 2.

³ Liutprand, iv. c. 3. Muratori, *Ann. d'Italia*, sub ann. 939.

bribed to peace by the surrender of part of his Provençal dominions. Then Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, descended the Alps, and occupied Verona. He retreated with discomfiture and disgrace.

At length arose a more formidable rival. Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, had married Willa, the daughter of Boso, King Hugh's brother, on A.D. 936.
Berengar,
Marquis of
Ivrea. whom the King had bestowed the dukedom of

Tuscany. Jealous of his brother's wealth, and of certain splendid ornaments, in which Boso and his wife took great delight, Hugh despoiled his brother of the dukedom, which he then granted to one of his own bastards. Berengar had been suspected, with his brother Ansehar Duke of Spoleto of dangerous designs against the King. Ansehar took up arms and fell in battle. Berengar was then at the court of the king, who had determined to seize and blind him. Berengar received A.D. 940.

timely warning (it is said from Lothair, King Hugh's son, who reigned with conjoint authority), and fled beyond the Alps. There he remained till, almost summoned by the general discontent of the Italian princes, he descended the Alps as a deliverer. The great ecclesiastics were the first to desert the cause of King Hugh. Manasseh, on the promise of the archbishopric of Milan, opened Trent. Adelard, his officer, who commanded the fortress Fiumigara in that district, was rewarded for joining in his master's treason, by the promise of the bishopric of Como. Princes crowded around Berengar to obtain castles or domains, A.D. 945.

ecclesiastics monasteries or bishoprics. Berengar dispossessed the spiritual as unscrupulously as the temporal sovereigns. He expelled Joseph from the see of Brescia; he broke his promise of the see of Como to

Adelard, and gave it to Waldo, a lawless robber, who plundered the highways, and blinded his captives; to Adelard he gave the see of Reggio. He was only prevented by large bribes from dispossessing the bishops of Parma and Piacenza. Guido, Bishop of Modena, had been gained to his party by the rich abbey of Nonantula.

Berengar was content to leave the title of King of Italy for a short time to Hugh and his son Lothair, while himself possessed the real power. Hugh, disgusted at this humiliation, speedily withdrew, with his enormous wealth, beyond the Alps, leaving the vain but perilous ensigns of royalty to his promising son. He died the year after his retirement. Lothair lingered on for three years in this inglorious kingly servitude, and died in the flower of his age, poisoned, as of course it was rumored, by Berengar — by Berengar, whose life he had saved from the plots of his own father, Hugh of Provence. Berengar and his son Adalbert became kings of Italy.

During the whole reign of Hugh of Provence, notwithstanding the open or treacherous assaults of that king, Alberic, whether as an armed tyrant, commanding Rome from the Castle of St. Angelo, or as the head of a republic, and recognised by the voice of the Roman people, had maintained his authority. He had ruled for twenty-two years; he bequeathed that authority, on his death, to his son Octavian.

Octavian, though only nineteen years old, aspired to unite, in his own person, the civil and spiritual supremacy. He was already in holy orders; two years after the death of his father Alberic, the Pope Agapetus II. died; and Octavian, by the voluntary or

Pope John
XII.
Nov. 955.

enforced suffrages of the clergy and the people, was elected Pope. He was the first of the Roman pontiffs who changed, or rather took a second ecclesiastical name; the civil government seems to have been conducted in that of Octavian; the Church was administered under that of John XII.

Berengar and his son Adalbert, kings of Italy, had made no attempt on Rome during the strong rule of Alberic. The youth of the new Governor and Pope tempted them to threaten the independence of the city, and to bring it within the sphere of their tyranny. Of that new tyranny Italy was now again weary. Berengar, his wife Willa, and his son Adalbert, are charged with acts of atrocious cruelty and oppression, in every part of their large dominions.

CHAPTER XII.

THE OTHOS ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

IN the mean time had arisen in Germany a monarch more powerful than had appeared in Europe since the death of Charlemagne. Otho the Great, of the Saxon line, had inherited a preponderating power in the North of Germany. He had greatly increased it by his own successes in war. The Danes, the Slavonians, the Hungarians, had been subdued by his arms, or awed by the terrors of his victorious forces. All Germany submitted to his sway, or acknowledged his superiority. Already, some years before, the formidable Otho had made a descent on Italy; but his expedition was more that of an adventurous Paladin of later days for the deliverance of a captive princess, than the invasion of a mighty sovereign. That princess had pretensions indeed to the kingdom of Italy. The beautiful Adelaide, the widow of King Lothair (the gallant but unfortunate son and heir of Hugh of Provence), had been cruelly persecuted after her husband's death, by Berengar, whose son Adalbert aspired to her hand. She had been stripped of all her jewels and costly raiment, beaten, her hair torn from her head, and plunged into a foetid dungeon.¹ She made her escape, with the assistance

¹ So writes S. Odilo, Abbot of Clugny. — *Vita S. Adelard.* apud Canisium. Hroswitha de Gest. Odon.

of a priest, and took refuge under the protection of the Bishop of Reggio. That prelate intrusted her to the care of his brother, who held the strong castle of Canosa, in fee of that Church. Canosa defied the siege of Berengar and Adalbert. Otho, whose son LU- A.D. 951.

dolf had already made a descent, not brilliantly successful, upon Italy, suddenly swept down from the Alps, rescued and married the captive princess. Berengar was obliged to open the gates of Pavia to the irresistible Otho.

Otho made some disposition for a visit to Rome to receive the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope Agapetus; but Alberic would brook no master. The Pope at his dictation, declined to receive the dangerous stranger. Otho returned to Germany to suppress the menaced rebellion of his son Ludolf, who had taken offence at his father's second marriage. He was followed in the next year by Berengar and Adalbert, who stooped to receive the kingdom of Italy as vassals of the German Otho. They promised — no doubt the secret of their humiliation was the widespread discontent of their Italian subjects — to rule with greater ^{Augsburg, Aug. 7. A.D. 952.} equity and moderation.¹ But for four years

Otho was occupied with his German wars, civil wars against his sons, and wars against the Hungarians;² the tyranny of Berengar and his son Adalbert weighed on

¹ Hroswitha de Gestis Oddonis: —

“Hunc Regem certè digno suscepit honore,
Restituens illi sublatis culmina Regni,
Ista percipere tantum sub conditione.
— seu subjectis jussis esset studiosus.

* * * * et

Ut post hæc populum regeret clementius ipsum
Quem prius Imperio nimium contrivit amaro.”

² On these wars read Giesebrecht, *Deutsche Kaiserzeit*, Braunschweig, 1855.

the necks of his subjects with all its former burden. The son of Otho, Ludolf, who had returned to the allegiance of his father, was first despatched with a great army to the deliverance of Italy. After having overcome all resistance, Ludolf died, by one account slain in battle by the hand of King Adalbert, by another A.D. 957. poisoned through the agency of Berengar; more probably of a fever. Berengar and Adalbert, who had cowered before the irresistible enemy, resumed their sway, and their tyranny was aggravated by revenge. The cry was again loud and universal for the interposition of the Germans.

The Church by its prelates was the first and most urgent in its supplications to the Transalpine for deliverance from her Italian tyrants. The Pope John XII. (Octavian), menaced by Berengar, sent two ambassadors of high rank on this important mission. The Archbishop of Milan, who had been dispossessed to make room for Manasseh of Arles, and Waldo, the deprived Bishop of Como, joined in the appeal. Many of the Italian princes were equally impatient for succor.

All Italy looked for the coming of the new Charlemagne. On his appearance resistance vanished. Berengar and Adalbert shut themselves up in their strongest fortresses. It was a triumphal procession to Pavia—to Rome. At Pavia Otho the Great was crowned King of Italy, at Rome the Pope anointed him as Emperor. Thenceforth the King of Germany claimed to be Western Emperor.¹

A.D. 961-2.

Arrived at

Rome Feb.

King of Germany claimed to be Western Emperor.¹

¹ Otho of Freisingen says of the Emperor Otho: "Imperium Romanum virtute suâ ad Francos orientales reduxit."—vi. 24.

"Quemcunque sibi Germania regem
Præfuit, hunc dives submisso vertice Roma
Suscipit."—*Gunther, in Ligur.*

Compare Eichhorn, *Deutsche Staats und Rechts Geschichte*, ii. p. 36.

Otho swore to protect the Church of Rome against all her enemies, to maintain her rights and privileges, to restore her lands and possessions, when he should have recovered them, and to make no change in the government of Rome without the sanction of the Pope. John XII. and the Roman people took the oath of allegiance to the Emperor; they swore more particularly A.D. 962. to abandon all connexion with Berengar and Purification of the Virgin. his son. The oath was taken on the body of St. Peter.

Yet no sooner had the Emperor returned to Pavia, than the perfidious John, finding that he had unwarily introduced a master instead of an obsequious Treachery of the Pope. ally, began to enter into correspondence with Adalbert, who, driven from every Italian city, had found refuge with the Saracens. Rumors of this treason reached the Emperor. The noble German would not believe the monstrous perfidy; he sent some trustworthy officers to inquire into the truth; they returned with a fearful list of crimes, of license, and cruelty with which the son of Alberic, who seems entirely to have sunk the character of Pope in that of the young warlike, secular prince, was charged by the unanimous voice of Rome. The Emperor calmly replied that the Pope was young, the counsel and example of good A.D. 962. men would soon work a change. In the mean time Otho proceeded to besiege first Queen Willa in the castle San Giulio in the island of the Lago di Garda, then Berengar in his strong fortress of Monte Leone near Montefeltro.

The Pope sent two legates to the camp of Otho to promise amendment, but at the same time boldly re-criminated on the Emperor, as having infringed on his part the solemn treaty. He had seized two of the

Pope's vassals, and compelled them to swear allegiance to himself. Nor had he restored, as he had sworn, the dominions of the Pope. Otho condescended to reply that these men had been seized at Capua, on a mission to Constantinople, hostile to him; that at the same time others had been taken, who on pretence of a religious mission to the Hungarians,¹ were to incite those unbelievers to attack the dominions of Otho; that he had not restored all the Roman territory, only because he had not yet recovered it from the enemies of the See. The treason of the Pope, on the other hand, rested not on vague rumor; the whole correspondence with the Pope's signature and seal was in his hands. Otho sent two bishops, Landobard, a Saxon, and Liutprand of Cremona, to offer the Pope satisfaction as to the charges against his honor: either their own oath, or the wager of battle. His soldier would maintain the fair fame of the Emperor against any champion appointed by the Pope. The Pope, says Liutprand, not without manifest indignation, refused both the oath of the bishops, and the single combat of the warriors. King Adalbert, in the mean time, had emerged from his retreat among July, 963. the Saracens, and appeared publicly in Rome. Otho marched at once upon the capital; the Pontiff had reckoned on the cordial support of the people; they recoiled: the Pope and Adalbert fled together from Rome.

The Emperor summoned an ecclesiastical council; it was attended by the Archbishops of Aquileia (by deputy), of Milan, of Ravenna, and Hamburg; by two

¹ The Legates to the Hungarians had letters, *plumbo signatas*, to exhort them, *ut super Ottonem Imperatorem irruant*. — Liutprand, *Hist. Otton.* c. 6.

German, and two French metropolitans; by a great number of bishops and presbyters from Lombardy, Tuscany, and all parts of Italy. The whole militia of Rome assembled as a guard to the council round the church of St. Peter. The proceedings of the council mark the times. Inquiry was made why the Pope was not present. A general cry of astonishment broke forth from the clergy and the people — “The very Iberians, Babylonians, and Indians have heard the monstrous crimes of the Pope. He is not a wolf who condescends to sheep’s clothing; his cruelty, his diabolical dealings are open, avowed, disdain concealment.” The calmer justice of the Emperor demanded specific charges. The cardinal presbyter rose and declared that he had seen Pope John celebrate mass without himself communicating. Another, that he had ordained a bishop in a stable; that he had taken bribes for the consecration of bishops, and had ordained a bishop of Todi who was but ten years old. “For his sacrileges, all eyes might behold them;” they alluded, probably, to the dilapidation of the churches, which were open to the weather, and so much out of repair, that the worshippers could not assemble from fear lest the roofs should fall on their heads. Darker charges followed, mingled with less heinous, in strange confusion; charges of adultery, incest, with the names of the females, one his father’s concubine, another a widow and her niece; he had made the Lateran palace a brothel; he had been guilty of hunting: charges of cruelty, the blinding of one dignified ecclesiastic, the castrating another, both had died under the operation: he had let loose fire and sword, and appeared himself constantly armed with sword, lance, helmet, and breastplate. Both ecclesias-

Trial of the
Pope, Nov. 6.

tics and laymen accused him of drinking wine for the love of the devil; of invoking, when gambling, heathen deities, the devils Jove and Venus. He had perpetually neglected matins and vespers, and never signed himself with the sign of the cross.

The Emperor could only speak German; he commanded the Bishop of Cremona to address the assembly in Latin. Liutprand warned the council, he adjured them by the blessed Virgin and by St. Peter, not to bring vague accusations, nor such as could not be supported by accredited testimony, against the holy father. Bishops, deacons, clergy, and people with one voice replied, "If we do not prove these and more crimes against the Pope, may St. Peter, who holds the keys of heaven, close the gates against us; may we be stricken with anathema, and may the anathema be ratified at the day of judgment!" They appealed to the whole army of Otho, whether they had not seen the Pope in full armor on the other side of the Tiber; but for the river he had been taken in that attire.

Letters were sent summoning the Pope to answer to these accusations; accusations some of them so obscene, that they would have been thought immodest if made against stage players.¹ If the Pope dreaded any assault from the enraged multitude, the Emperor answered for the security of his person. The Pope's reply was brief, contemptuous, — "John, the servant of God, to all the bishops. We hear that you design to elect a new Pope: if you do, in the name of Almighty God, I excommunicate you, and forbid you to confer orders, or to celebrate mass!"

Thrice was Pope John cited before the Council.

¹ "Ut si de histrionibus dicerentur vobis verecundiam ingererent"

Messengers were sent to Tivoli; the answer was, "The Pope was gone out to shoot."¹ Unprecedented evils demand unprecedented remedies. The Emperor was urged to expel this new Judas from the seat John deposed, Dec. 4, 963. of the Apostle, and to sanction a new election. Leo, the chief secretary of the Roman See, was unanimously chosen, though a layman, in the room of the apostate John XII.

But the army of Otho, a feudal army, and bound to do service for a limited period, began to diminish; part had been injudiciously dispersed on distant enterprises; the Romans, as usual, soon grew weary of a foreign, a German yoke. The emissaries of Pope John watched the opportunity: a furious insurrection of the people broke out against the Emperor and his Pope. The valor of Otho, who forced the barricades of the bridge over the Tiber, subdued the rebellion. He took a terrible revenge. The supplications of Leo with difficulty arrested the carnage. Otho soon after left A.D. 964.

Rome, and marched towards Camerina and Spoleto in pursuit of King Adalbert. The King Berengar and his wife Willa were taken in the castle of St. Leo, and sent into Germany.

Hardly, however, had Otho left the city, when a new rebellion, organized by the patrician females of Rome, rose on the defenceless Leo, and opened the gates of the city to John. Leo with difficulty Returns to Rome. escaped to the camp of Otho. The remorseless John reëntered the city, resumed his pontifical state, seized and mutilated the leaders of the imperial party, Feb. 964. of one he cut off the right hand, of another the tongue, the nose, and two fingers; in this plight they appeared

¹ "Pharetratus jam in campestem abierat."

in the imperial camp. An obsequious synod reversed the decrees of that which had deposed John. The Roman people had now embraced the cause of the son of Feb. 27. Alberic with more resolute zeal; for the Emperor was compelled to delay till he could reassemble a force powerful enough to undertake the siege of the city. Ere this, however, his own vices had delivered Rome from her champion or her tyrant, Christendom from her worst pontiff. While he was pursuing his amours in a distant part of the city, Pope John XII. May 14, 964. was struck dead by the hand of God, as the more religious supposed; others by a more natural cause, the poignard of an injured husband.¹

But it was a Roman or Italian, perhaps a republican feeling which had latterly attached the citizens to the son of Alberic, not personal love or respect for his pontifical character. They boldly proceeded at once, without regard to the Emperor, to the election of a new pope, Benedict V.

Otho soon appeared before the walls: he summoned the city, and ordered every Roman who attempted to escape to be mutilated. The republic was forced to surrender. Benedict, the new pope, was brought before the Emperor. The Cardinal Archdeacon, who had adhered to the cause of Leo, demanded by what right he had presumed to usurp the pontifical robes during the lifetime of Leo, the lawful Pope. "If I have sinned," said the humbled prelate, "have mercy upon me." The Emperor is said to have wept. Benedict threw himself before the feet of Otho, drew off the sacred pallium, and delivered up his crozier to Leo. Leo

¹ Other authorities, followed by Muratori, speak of a sickness of eight days.

broke it, and showed it to the people. Benedict was degraded to the order of deacon, and sent into banishment in Germany. He died at Hamburg.

The grateful, or vassal pope, in a council, recognizes the full right of the Emperor Otho and his June 23, 964 successors in the kingdom of Italy, as Hadrian that of Charlemagne, to elect his own successors to the Empire, and to approve the Pope. This right was to belong for ever to the King of the Roman Empire, and to none else.¹

Early in the next year the Emperor Otho recrossed the Alps.² Leo VIII. died, and a deputation March, 965. from Rome followed the Emperor to Germany, to solicit the reinstatement of the exiled Benedict to the Sept. 965. popedom. But Benedict was dead also. The Bishop of Narni (John XIII.), with the approbation or by the command of the Emperor, was elected to the papacy.³

In these dark times the form of a republic seems dimly to arise with magistratures bearing the old and venerable names of consuls, tribunes, and prefects. But whether it was a confederacy of the Roman barons in the city and the neighborhood who usurped these functions, the titles of which had perhaps never been extinct, or a popular movement towards independence, it is difficult to determine. At all events, its avowed aim was to shake off the yoke as well of the Pope as of the Emperor.

¹ See the law in Pertz, Leg. ii. 167. The form of the Bull is thought suspicious; of the substance there is no doubt. — Jaffé, Regesta, p. 324.

² The Emperor Otho returned from Italy bearing many precious reliques, and splendid marbles to adorn his noble church at Magdeburg. — Thietmar, i. 10, 11. He was at Pavia Christmas 964.

³ Otho created and disposed of bishoprics with full and unlimited powers — Thietmar.

Scarcely had John XIII. assumed the pontificate than Dec. 16, 965. the barons and the people began to murmur against the haughtiness of the new pontiff. They expelled him from the city with one consent. The Prefect Rotfred, not without personal insult to the Pope, assumed the government of Rome; for ten months John XIII. was an exile from his see, at first a prisoner, afterwards in freedom. From his retreat in Campania he wrote with urgent entreaty to the Emperor. Otho A.D. 966. made the cause of John his own; for the third time he descended the Alps; the terror of his approach appalled the popular faction. In a counter insurrection in favor of the Pope, Rotfred the prefect was killed, and the gates opened to the pontiff; he was Nov. 12, 966. received with hymns of joy and gratulation.¹ At Christmas Otho entered Rome; and the Emperor and the Pope wreaked a terrible vengeance at that holy season on the rebellious city. The proud Roman titles seemed but worthy of derision to the German Emperor and his vassal Pope. The body of the prefect who had expelled John from the city was dug up out of his grave and torn to pieces. The Consuls escaped with banishment beyond the Alps; but the twelve Tribunes were hanged; the actual prefect set upon an ass, with a wine-bag on his head, led through the streets, scourged, and thrown into prison. All Europe, hardened as it was to acts of inhumanity, shuddered at these atrocities. The Byzantine Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, reproached the ambassador of Otho at Constantinople with his barbarity. Liutprand, though an Italian, was devoted to the Emperor and his cause: he haughtily answered, that his master had only punished, according to the

¹ Continuat. Reginon. sub ann. 696.

imperial laws of Theodosius and Justinian, insurgents against the Empire and the Pope; he had scourged, executed, hanged, and banished these sacrilegious rebels¹ who had broken their oath of allegiance. If he had not done so, he had been impious, unjust, tyrannical.²

The rebellion was crushed for a time; during the five remaining years of John's pontificate the presence of Otho overawed the refractory Romans. He ruled in peace. At his death the undisturbed vacancy of the See for three months implies the humble consultation of Otho's wishes (he had now returned to Germany) on the appointment of his successor.

The choice fell on Benedict VI., as usual of Roman birth. The factions of Rome now utterly baffle conjecture as to their motives, as to the passions, not the principles, which actuated their leaders. Twice (the second time after an interval of ten years, during which he was absent from Rome), the same man, a Cardinal Deacon, seizes and murders two Popes; sets himself up as Supreme Pontiff; but though with power to commit these enormities, he cannot maintain on either occasion his ill-won tiara.

The formidable Otho the Great³ died the year of

¹ "Jugulavit, suspendit, exilio relegavit." — Liutprand. The emperors of Constantinople had never abandoned their pretensions to Rome and Italy. Nicephorus resented the allegiance demanded by Otho of the princes of Benevento and Spoleto, and his hostilities against the few remaining possessions of the Greeks in Southern Italy. He demanded restoration of the Exarchate and of Rome, as the price to be paid for the hand of his daughter. The Romans will appear afterwards, more than once, in their desperation, turning for succor to the decrepit East.

² In the *Legatio* of Liutprand are some curious details on the Greek clergy. The passage often quoted from Liutprand about the degeneracy of the Romans refers to the *Byzantine* Romans.

³ "Post Carolum magnum regalem cathedram nunquam tantus patriæ rector atque defensor possedit." So writes Thietmar of Otho I.

the accession of Benedict VI.¹ Otho II., whose character was as yet unknown, had succeeded to the imperial throne; he had been already the colleague of his father in the Empire. He had been crowned at Rome by Pope John XIII.

The year after the accession of Otho II., on a sudden Bonifazio, surnamed Francone, described as the son of Ferruccio, a name doubtless well known to his contemporaries, seized the unsuspecting Pope Benedict and cast him into a dungeon, where shortly after he was strangled. Bonifazio assumed the papacy; but he had miscalculated the strength of his faction, in one month he was forced to fly the city. Yet he fled not with so much haste, but that he carried off all the treasures, even the sacred vessels from the church of St. Peter. He found his way to Constantinople, where he might seem to have been forgotten in his retreat. The peaceful succession of Benedict VII., the nephew or grandson of the famous Alberic, may lead to the conclusion that the faction of that family still survived, and was opposed to that of Bonifazio. The first act of Benedict, as might be expected, was the assembling a council for the excommunication of the murderer and anti-pope Boniface. This is the first and last important act in the barren annals of Pope Benedict VII. Under the protection of the Emperor Otho II., or by the strength of his Roman faction, he retained peaceful possession of the See for nine years,² an un-

¹ He died May 7, 973.

² Sismondi is probably right that *Domus* or *Domnus*, who is here inserted, was merely a title, *Dominus Benedictus*. This conjecture has the further recommendation of giving the full nine (or ten) years to the papacy of Benedict, according to the epitaph quoted by Baronius. Compare Jaffé, who quotes a work of Giesebrecht as conclusive.

usual period of quiet. He was succeeded, no doubt through the influence of the Emperor, by John XIV., who was no Roman, but Bishop of Pavia. But in the year of John's accession, Otho II. was preparing a great armament to avenge a terrible defeat by the Saracens. He had hardly fled from the conquering Saracens, made his escape from a Greek ship by leaping into the sea and swimming ashore.¹ He now threatened with all the forces of the realm to bridge the Straits of Messina, and reunite Sicily to the Empire of the West. In the midst of his preparations he died at Rome.²

The fugitive Bonifazio Francone had kept up his correspondence with Rome; he might presume on the unpopularity of a pontiff, if not of German birth, imposed by foreign influence, and now deprived of his all-powerful protector. With the same suddenness as before, he reappeared in Rome, seized the Pope, imprisoned him in the Castle of St. Angelo, of which important fortress he had become master, and there put him to death by starvation or by poison.³ He exposed the body to the view of the people, who dared not murmur. He seated himself, as it seems, unresisted, in the papal chair. The Holy See was speedily delivered from this murderous usurper. He died suddenly. The people revenged themselves for their own base acquiescence in his usurpation by cowardly insults on his dead body;⁴ it was dragged through the streets, July, 985.

¹ Muratori, *Annali*, ann. 982. Giesebrecht, p. 567.

² Richer, whose valuable chronicle the industry of Pertz has recovered, is very particular on the death of Otho II. He was suffering from indigestion, took four drachms of aloes, which brought on a bloody flux. — b. iii. c. 96.

³ *Chronic. Voltorn.* apud Muratori, t. i. p. 11. — R. I. Hermann. *Contract* sub ann. 984.

⁴ *Catal. Pap.* apud Eccard.

and at length buried, either by the compassion or the attachment, for Boniface must have had a powerful faction in Rome, of certain ecclesiastics. These bloody revolutions could not but destroy all reverence for their ecclesiastical rulers in the people of Rome. The Empire was vacant; Otho III., though he called himself King of Germany and of Italy, had not yet assumed the imperial crown; and Otho was a youth who had but newly succeeded to his father.

The Roman Republic, crushed by the overwhelming power of Otho the Great, now again assumes a distinct form and regular authority; and at the head of this republic is the Consul Crescentius, by the ecclesiastical writers condemned as a sacrilegious usurper, in modern days hailed as the champion and the martyr of Roman liberty. By a probable, if not a certain, genealogy, Crescentius descended from that famous, or infamous, line of Theodora, Marozia, and Alberic, who had so long ruled in Rome.¹ He was the grandson of Theodora

¹ Hoefler, in his *Deutsche Päpste*, a panegyric rather than a history of the German popes, has ingeniously traced this genealogy of the Crescentii from the various epitaphs preserved by Baronius:—

“Corpore hic recubat Crescentius inclytus ecce,
Eximius civis Romanus, Dux quoque magnus.
Ex magnis magna proles generatur et alta
Joanne patre, Theodorâ matre nitescens.”

This was the Crescentius “*caballi marmorei*” of Liutprand, vi. sub ann. 963; the Crescentius of Hermannus Contractus, who imprisoned and strangled Pope Benedict VII., A.D. 964. The *great* parents were Pope John X and Theodora. This Crescentius had two sons: 1. John, named by Hermann. Contract. sub ann. 689, as having slain the Prefect Rotfred. 2. Crescentius (Numantanus), the Consul. The elder Crescentius became a monk; and by this, and ample and exemplary donations to the Church, atoned for his sins—

“Se Domino tradidit habitum monachorum adeptus,
Quod templum donis amplis ditavit et agris,
Hinc omnis, quicumque legis rogitare memento,
Ut tandem *scelerum* veniam mereatur habere.”

He died July 7, 984.

and the Pope John of Ravenna ; by the mother's side he was nephew of Alberic. Crescentius was Master of the Castle of St. Angelo, so lately possessed by the usurper Boniface (who may have been supported by the Roman party, the house of Alberic), and the Castle of St. Angelo commanded Rome.

John XV., a Roman, had succeeded peaceably on the death of Boniface.¹ But either the Pope disdained to submit to the supremacy of the Consul, or Sept. 985. the Consul persecuted the Pope. John XV. was either driven from Rome, or retired into Tuscany. His complaints of his contumacious people were heard with favor by the King of Italy, the youthful Otho, whom the Pope tempted to Rome that he might receive the imperial crown. The Romans had too recent and bitter remembrance of the terrible vengeance exacted by the Germans for former revolts. The Pope was A.D. 987. permitted to return ; he was received with the utmost respect by the Consul and the Senate, whose powers he seems to have recognized without reserve. John XV. ruled for a period of eleven years, in quiet possession of his spiritual, if not of his secular, supremacy. The great imputation on his memory implies an accommodating temper, which would not provoke danger by ill-timed pride. He is charged too with excessive venality.² Possibly the Republic, in its usurpation of the papal power, may likewise have laid claim to some of the revenues of the Roman territory ; the Pope may have been thrown back on his spiritual resources, and

¹ Another John, son of Robert, who ruled for four months, is inserted by some writers ; but this John was called John XV.

² Abbo, the pious Abbot of Fleury, a pilgrim at Rome, describes him as 'turpis lucri cupidum, atque in omnibus actibus suis venalem.' — Quoted in Muratori, A.D. 996.

so justified to himself his extortions on the appellants to Rome.

But however Rome and the Roman people might depress the Pope, and keep him in subjection to the Consul and the Senate, the Pope had rarely been in these latter times a native but of Rome, at least of Italy. Rome heard with amazement, which it was constrained to suppress, and confusion which it dared not betray, that the Emperor had determined to unite in his own family, his barbarous German family, the Empire and the Papacy. Rome was not only to endure a foreign Emperor, but a foreign Pope. Christendom, in truth, would tolerate no longer the profound ignominy of the Papal See. There was still too much of true religion in the world to submit to such Popes as for nearly a century had profaned the throne of St. Peter. It was no insurrection of disobedience, nor of rebellion at the supremacy of the Roman See; it was an act of loyal reverence, of sincere respect. If Italy could not furnish more worthy pontiffs, Italy must forfeit her exclusive privilege. The determination might appear sudden, but it was the effect of moral indignation which had been long fermenting in the hearts of men, and broke forth when it could no longer be pent up in silence.

The descent of Otho III. to Italy might seem a great ecclesiastical armament of the Transalpine clergy to rescue the papacy from its debasement, the Pope from being the instrument or the victim of the turbulent factions in Rome: to put an end to the notorious vices, the licentiousness, the venality, the intrigues, the ferocious bloodthirstiness, which had so long degraded the head of Christendom.¹ Around the youthful Emperor,

¹ Vita S. Adalberti, apud Pertz.

on whose face the first dawn of manhood began to appear, were assembled at Ratisbon the great dignitaries of the realm, — Willigis Metropolitan of Mentz, Harburg of Salzburg, the Bishops Hildebald of Worms, Widerold of Strasburg, Rotberd of Spire, Notker of Liège, Haimo of Verdun, Lambert of Constance, Gotschalk of Freisingen, Christian of Passau, Alawick Abbot of Reichenau. Gerbert, the deposed Archbishop of Rheims, afterwards Pope Sylvester, was in the train.¹ Otho confessed himself to the saintly abbot, Romuald of St. Emmeran. And so the Emperor, environed by his hierarchical council, set forth amid the sound of bells and the chants of the clergy, men bearing the holy lance led the way.

Otho celebrated Easter at Pavia, and received the homage of the Lombard princes. He had ar- A.D. 996.
rived at Ravenna, where he was met by a message from the clergy, the senate, and the people of Rome, announcing the sudden death, by fever, of John XV., and humbly submitting to the wishes of the Emperor as to the appointment of his successor.

Otho at once proclaimed his determination to place his kinsman and chaplain Bruno, son of the Duke of Carinthia, on the vacant throne. Bruno was a youth of unblemished piety, of austere morals, morals ill suited for the state of Rome, and somewhat fiery temper. The Romans had gone too far to recede. The new Pope appeared in Rome, accompanied by Willigis of Mentz and Hildebald of Worms; he was received and consecrated with seeming joy. The more pious of the monks

¹ These names appear signed to an original document, dated Rome, May 24, 996, published by Höfer, *Zeitschrift für Archivkunde*, i. 538. — Quoted by Gfrörer, p. 1481.

did not disguise their delight. "The news that a seion of the imperial house, a man of holiness, of wisdom, and virtue, is placed upon the chair of St. Peter, is news more precious than gold and precious stones." So writes the holy Abbo of Fleury to his friend.¹

Rome, overawed, had submitted to receive the Pope; April, 996. the Pope was followed by the King of Germany, who received the imperial crown from the hands of Gregory V., the name assumed by the new Pope.

May 21. The Emperor held a Council with the ecclesiastics, a Diet with the civil authorities of Rome. The May 25. Consul Crescentius was summoned to appear before the latter (the Cæsar himself was on the tribunal), to answer for his offences. He was condemned to exile, but pardoned on the intercession of the Pope, who foresaw not how dangerous was his mercy. The Emperor exacted the vain homage of an oath of allegiance from the Romans to himself as Emperor, and an oath of fidelity to the Pope.

Otho withdrew from Rome and from Italy with almost as great rapidity as he had arrived;² with him departed the German prelates, whose followers perhaps had formed the greater part of the army, content with having achieved their great work, but having taken no measures to secure its permanence.

Gregory was left alone, to overawe as he could by the blamelessness of his life, his gentler virtues, the dignity of his spiritual character, the turbulent patricians and people of Rome, whom Crescentius had already roused and ruled by his eloquent reminiscences

¹ Mabillon. Act. Ord. S. Benedict. vi. 30.

² He was in Rome only till the end of May; in August at Pavia; 15th Sept. at Ingelheim. — Böhmer, Regesta, Ottonum, p. 767.

of their former liberties, of their republican glories; and Crescentius himself, who had already tasted the luxury of power. A year had not elapsed before the Pope was forced to fly from Rome, and reached Pavia in a state of utter destitution.¹ At Pavia he assembled a council of Italian bishops, and launched an excommunication against the rebel Crescentius; ignorant, in his own profound religious faith, how dead the Romans had become to these familiar terrors. Crescentius laughed to scorn the spiritual menace of an unarmed and unprotected pontiff.

Crescentius wanted an antipope, and an anti-pope soon offered himself: he was not a Roman, but, singular as it may at first appear, a Greek, at least a Calabrian, a subject of the Greek empire. At this juncture the ambassadors of Otho III. at Constantinople returned to Rome; among these was the Bishop of Placentia. Philagathus was a Calabrian of mean birth; his knowledge of Greek, still spoken in the parts of Southern Italy subject to the Greek Emperor, had recommended him to the notice of Theophania, the Byzantine wife of Otho II., the mother and guardian of Otho III. He had been employed in important affairs; had been ambassador more than once to Constantinople, where he had perhaps fostered the ambition, never yet extinct, in the Byzantine Emperor, of resuming his supremacy in Italy. The East, by the marriage of her princess with the Emperor of the West, had again become more mingled up with European affairs; but that connexion would be no bar to engagements with the Roman insurgents against the authority of the Western Empire.

¹ "Nudus, omnium rerum." — Ann. Hildesheim, 996. *Annalista Saxo*.

Philagathus had obtained, it was said, by violent means the bishopric of Placentia: he had amassed great wealth by the plunder of that church, and was prepared with his wealth to be the anti-pope of the Roman republic. Crescentius and John XVI. agreed to divide the dominion of Rome; and, under the protection of the Greek empire, the one with the title of patrician or consul to administer the temporal, and the other the spiritual affairs of the city. It cannot be supposed that Crescentius, whatever may have been the views of the subtle Greek Pope, had any serious designs of withdrawing Rome from its position as head of the Western Empire, or of restoring it to its dependence on the despised East.¹ But in his desperation he caught at any alliance, and that alliance with the East was interpreted by the jealousy of the Germans as a deliberate transference of his allegiance. History, in truth, is always seeking for policy, when passions (as is so often the case) are the ruling motives of men. And the ambition of Crescentius was a passion, rather than a calm and heroic aim; it was not content with the temporal power, under the subordinate title of patrician or consul; the asserter of the liberties of Rome (an extant medal confirms the statement of one, though but of one historian) himself assumed the empire.

But the new Emperor or Consul, and the Pope, to whom all agree in ascribing fox-like cunning, had strangely miscalculated their strength. No sooner was

¹ Arnulf of Milan (apud Muratori, *Scrip. Ital.* iv.), said to have made accurate investigations into the history of Rome at that time, writes of John XVI.: "*De quo dictum est, quod Romani decus Imperii in Græcos transferre tentasset. Si quidem consultu et ope quorundam civium Romanorum, præcipuè Crescentii cujusdam prædivitis Apostolicam sedem jam violenter invaserat, dejecto eo, qui tunc insederat, venerabili Papâ.*" — c. ii

Otho released from the Slavonian war in which he was engaged, than he appeared in Italy¹ at the head of an overwhelming force of Germans and Italians; Italy was prostrate before him. He reached Rome, he entered Rome without the least resistance. Pope John made his escape, but was taken and brought back. The most horrible punishment was inflicted on the traitor to the Empire, the usurper of the Papal See. His eyes were put out, his nose and his tongue cut off, and in this state, it is said by the command of the hard-hearted Pope himself, he was paraded through the streets on an ass with his face to the tail, and the common form of mockery — a wine-bladder, on his head.²

Crescentius shut himself up in the Castle of St. Angelo, and for a short time defied the Emperor. He was at length persuaded to capitulate; but the perfidious Otho ordered him to be beheaded with twelve of his leading partisans; their bodies were hung with their heads downward round the battlements of the castle.³

¹ 997. He was at Pavia, Jan. 5, 998.

² Thietmar, iv. 21. "Gregorius V. . . . apprehendere fecit illum scelestum invasorem, et fecit ei oculos eruere et nasum cum linguâ abscindere et in asello sedere faciens Romam fecit eum circumduci, cum utro in capite." — Chronic. Estens. apud Muratori, S. L. iii. 2, p. 337. Compare Cat. Pontif. Eccard iv. Acta S. Nili. That holy hermit is there said to have interceded for the life of his wretched compatriot. The Emperor consented; but the savage Pope was not yet satisfied. ὁ δὲ ἄγριος Πάπας ἐκείνος, μὴ χορτάσθεις ἐφ' οἷς ἔπραξεν εἰς τὸν προορηθέντα Φιλάγαθον, tore his dress from him, and then ordered him to be paraded through the city, as in the text. Out of this Hoffer has made a religious romance about the Pope's indignation at John's wearing the dress of a priest, not of a penitent (as if the poor blinded and mutilated prisoner could choose his dress). With more flagrant dishonesty, he attributes the cruelty of the Pope to the Roman people. Nilus, a Greek it is true, predicted the wrath of God both against Pope and Emperor. On the same authority (Acta S. Nili) rests the pilgrimage of Otho to Mount Garganus to expiate his cruelty towards John XVI.

³ Rudolphus Glaber has an incredible story of Crescentius appearing before the Emperor, and being allowed to réenter the castle.

So, says the historian, turbulent Rome was awed to peace before the Emperor.¹

But if Rome could not defend, it could revenge itself. Feb. 999. The German Pope enjoyed his recovered dignity hardly a year, and that not without disturbance; he was cut off in the flower of his age, as it was commonly believed by poison. Crescentius, too, was fearfully avenged; how avenged the close of three or four years will show, neither to the honor of the Emperor, nor of Rome.²

¹ "Sic Roma ante mobilis regis quievit in oculis." — Arnulf.

² "Sed post discessum ejus (Ottonis III.) a Romanis expulsus, ac deinde veneno peremptus est." — Vit. S. Meinweri, c. 10. Compare Acta S. Nili. Gfrörer, with his marvellous felicity for discerning recondite villanies, attributes Gregory V.'s death to his successor!! whom he calls the "serpent of Ravenna — die Schlange zu Ravenna!" — p. 1507.

CHAPTER XIII.

OTHO III. POPE SILVESTER II.

GREGORY V. had died, but the youthful Emperor Otho lived, revolving magnificent schemes of empire, and little foreseeing the fate which awaited him so speedily in Rome, the object and the centre of his ambitious designs. The first Millemial period of Christianity was drawing to its close. In many parts of Christendom there prevailed a deep and settled apprehension that with the thousandth year of Christ the world would come to an end. That last day, when Christ would return to judge the world; the day which, since the times of the Apostles, the more profoundly religious, especially in periods of more than usual darkness and calamity, had beheld as immediately at hand, as actually bursting upon the world, could not delay beyond this fatal period. The vague but awful language of prophecy had dwelt in strong terms on the period of a thousand years, as if divinely appointed to enclose certain phases of human history; and many of the most dreadful predicted signs (never wanting to those who seek for them with the sagacity of terror), the wars and rumors of wars, above all the want of faith upon the earth, might seem to justify these cowering apprehensions of the timid—the triumphant anticipations of the more ardent and hopeful believers. At

the beginning of the century, the end of the world had been announced by a grave council.¹ The end of the world is at hand, was publicly preached at Paris.² Men hastened to propitiate the coming, almost present Judge, by the sacrifice of their ill-gotten, now useless possessions. The deeds of the time, the donations of estates, and of all other gifts to the Church, are inscribed with the significant phrase, the end of the world being at hand.³

But while these fears were lurking in the hearts of pious but obscure men ; while they were darkening the dreams of holy recluses, and dictating the wills of penitent sinners trembling on the brink of the grave ; the great men of Europe, the secular and ecclesiastical potentates entertained no timid misgivings as to the duration of the world. In Italy, in Rome the centre of Italy, these terrors were unknown. The Emperor himself, instead of apprehending the close, looked to the opening of the new Millennium but as the dawn of a Western Empire, as vast and comprehensive, more firmly established, and more stably organized, than that of Charlemagne. Otho had imagined the reëstablish

¹ See Gieseler, *Lehrbuch*, 2, 1, p. 267. Michelet, *Hist. des Français*, lib. iv. c. 1, sub init. "Dum jam jamque adventus imminet illius in majestate terribili ubi omnes cum gregibus suis venient pastores in conspectum pastoris æterni." — *Concil. Trosleian.* sub ann. 909.

² Abbo, the Abbot of Fleury, had heard this sermon in 990. — Galland, xiv. 141. "Æstimabatur enim ordo temporum et elementorum præterita ab initio moderans secula in chaos decidisse perpetuum, atque humani generis interitum." — Radolf. Glaber, l. iv. 39.

³ "Appropinquante mundi termino."

But compare Dr. Todd's *Donnellan Lectures*, who curiously traces the expectation of the final judgment through every century. Dr. Todd denies that the clergy encouraged the donations of land — "appropinquante mundi termino" — more about the year 1000 than at other times. It is a question hardly capable of proof.

ment of the Roman Empire, with Rome for its capital.¹ In all the hopefulness of youth, in the pride of an imperial descent for three generations, he resolved on the vast but impossible scheme of restoring Rome to her ancient authority as the seat of empire.² The reformation of the clergy by the renovated power of the Pope, the correction of that notorious avarice and venality for which Rome was already infamous,³ was to be accomplished by the appointment of a Supreme Pontiff truly apostolic in his character. The two great powers, the spiritual and the temporal, each working in his separate sphere, were to dwell together in the same eternal metropolis, and give laws, wise and holy and salutary laws, to Christendom.⁴ Rome might seem to have cast a spell upon the mind of the Teuton; it was on the Aventine Hill that he conceived and brooded over this great vision. He dismissed his German followers; he returned hastily, having appointed the new Pope, to Germany: in Germany it was observed, not without jealousy, that he was environed by Italians.

¹ "Imperator antiquam Romanorum consuetudinem jam ex parte magnâ deletam suis cupiens renovare temporibus, multa faciebat, quæ diversi diversè sentiebant." — Thietmar, iv. 29.

² "Româ solum quam præ ceteris diligebat ac semper excolebat, exceptâ." — 30.

³ "Tota Italia Roma mihi visa est; Romanorum mores mundus perhorrescit." — So had written Gerbert, Epist. 40, apud Duchesne, ii. 728. Gerbert was to know more of Rome. Thietmar writes of Rome: "Corruptis autem pecuniâ cunctis primatibus maximèque Romanis quibus cuncta sunt venalia." — iii. 5.

⁴ "Eodem tempore imperator Romam profectus in antiquo palatio, quod est in Monte Aventino, versabatur, et sicut juvenis tam viribus audax quam gerere potens, magnum quiddam ibid et impossibile cogitans, virtutem Romani Imperii ad potentiam veterum Regum adtollere conabatur. Mores etiam ecclesiasticos quos avaritia Romanorum pravis commercationum usibus vitiabat, ad normam prioris gratiæ reformare astimabat." — Chron. Camerac. c. 114, apud Bouquet, x. 296. Compare Giesebrecht, p. 680 *et seqq.*

Yet as if too his mind was not exempt from that holy
A.D. 1000. awe which prevailed in other parts of Europe, the conduct of Otho during his short residence in Germany had a serious and melancholy character. He made a pilgrimage to Gniesen, to the grave of Adalbert, the Apostle of Bohemia, the friend of his youth ; he entered the town as a penitent, with discrowned head, and naked feet. At Quedlinburg he celebrated Easter with his sister, the holy abbess Adelheid. At Aix-la-Chapelle, in obedience to a dream, he commanded the grave of the great Teutonic Emperor of the West, Charlemagne, to be opened. The body was found seated on a golden throne in royal apparel, with a crown of gold and jewels, and the sceptre in his hand. Otho took a cross of gold from his neck, and some part of his raiment, and commanded the tomb to be again closed over his imperial predecessor. This singular ceremony, this investiture, as it were, by the dead Charlemagne, at all events, this association of the two great names, coincided with the visionary ambition of Otho, and with the specific object of that ambition.

Nor was the successor of Gregory V. a man to despair of the future fortunes of the world, to acquiesce in dreaming and indolent prostration of mind in the approaching termination of human affairs. Gerbert had gradually risen by his great abilities ; his sagacity in ruling the minds of men ; his learning, which awed his age ; his unimpeachable morals, and his character for profound piety, through all the successive steps of ecclesiastical advancement to the second see in the West.

Gerbert was born near Avrillac in Auvergne, of
Gerbert. obscure parentage. He was received into the

school of the Clugniac Abbey at Avrillac. The abbot Gerald admired the indefatigable thirst for knowledge and the fervent piety of the youth, who felt himself born for great purposes. It happened that Borel, the Count of Barcelona, visited the monastery; he took the youthful student with him into Spain. There the zeal of Gerbert did not prevent him from profiting by the mathematical science and advanced knowledge then exclusively possessed in Europe by the Mohammedan schools.¹ He is said to have visited Cordova, where the Omniade Caliph, Hakim II., held his splendid court, and patronized the peaceful arts and sciences. But the learned and scientific studies of Gerbert, so far beyond his age, were not those of a recluse and contemplative monk; nor did his Arabian skill in arithmetic, geometry, and astrology perhaps rather than astronomy, fall under the suspicion with which they were looked upon in later legend, as forbidden and magic arts. Gerbert must be archbishop and Pope, and incur all the hatred inevitable during contentious times in such high functions, before he is branded as a necromancer. With Count Borel, and with Hatto, Bishop of Vich, in Catalonia, Gerbert visited Rome.² There he attracted the notice of the Pope (John XII.) and of the Emperor Otho I. By Otho he was recommended to Adalbero, Archbishop of Rheims. He taught in the school of that city, the ecclesiastical metropolis of the Franco-Gallic church. He accompanied the Archbishop Adalbero again to Italy in the expedition of Otho II. That Emperor bestowed on him the famous Abbey of Bobbio.

¹ His Geometry is said to indicate Arabian sources of knowledge.

² It was during this expedition that he had his curious disputation (the first scientific scholastic disputation) with Otric the Saxon. See the remarkable details in Richer.

But if the Italian manners of Rome shocked the piety of Gerbert, the turbulent and intriguing monks of Bobbio gave him no peace. Their poverty and nakedness distressed the Abbot. Former abbots had wasted, had even alienated the estates of that once splendid foundation of St. Columban.¹ The neighboring nobles who had obtained possession of the lands of the abbey demanded the ratification of their usurped rights.² Gerbert was persecuted; accused before the Emperor and the Empress Adelheid. He fled to Rome, with nothing left but his pastoral staff, and his apostolic ordination. But the Pope, trembling for his own life, could give him no protection; and the death of his patron Otho II. left him utterly defenceless. He abandoned Italy, lest there he should be obliged to join the enemies of Otho.³ He returned to Rheims to live under the patronage of Archbishop Adalbero. For ten years⁴ he taught in the school of Rheims the whole range of human science;⁵ at the same time he acted as secretary

* "Cum videam monachos meos attenuari fame; premi nuditate . . . nescio quibus codicibus, quos libellos vocant, totum Sanctuarium Domini venundatum est. Collecta pecunia nunquam reperitur; apothecæ et horrea exhausta sunt: sed in marsupiiis nihil est." — Gerbert, *Epist. ad Othon. Imper.* Compare *Epist. iii.* to the Bishop of Tortona. *Epists. iv., v., and xii. et seqq.*

² *Epist. xx.*

³ See the five first of Gerbert's epistles, apud Bouquet.

⁴ This probably includes his former residence and teaching.

⁵ Richer is diffuse on the whole course of Gerbert's lectures. They comprehended rhetoric, logic, music, geometry, astronomy. He explained the poets Virgil, Statius, Terence; the satirists Persius, Juvenal, Horace; the historian Lucan. Richer describes the "sphere" of Gerbert, and the Abacus, seemingly as wonders, yet unknown north of the Pyrenees. M. Haureau (*Hist. de la Philosophie Scholastique*) seems to think rather more highly of Gerbert's treatise *De Rationali et Ratione Ut* (published by Pez, *Thes. Anecd. v. 1*) than the authors of the *Hist. Littéraire*, and M. Cousin, p. 154.

to the Archbishop; in the Archbishop's name and in his own maintained a constant correspondence with Adelheid, the widow of the elder; with the Greek Theophania, the widow of the second and mother of the third Otho.¹

The great but almost silent revolution was now taking place which raised the house of Capet to the throne of the effete race of Charlemagne. Rise of Hugh Capet. Hugh Capet received the crown of France from the hands of the Archbishop of Rheims.² His son June, 987. Robert was consecrated by the same holy prelate. Christmas, 987. On the death of Archbishop Adalbero, Hugh's succession, Jan. 26, 988. a few months after, the metropolitan throne of Rheims might seem, like that of the Roman pontiffs, to have become the mark of secular as well as of spiritual ambition. But the contest for this hierarchical dignity, with no less violence and treachery, had something of feudal character. Adalbero, according to Gerbert, had bequeathed to him the care, the primate had hoped the succession to the See.³ But it was too valuable a prize to be surrendered at once to a low born man, however the most distinguished in Christendom for learning and science. Arnulf, a bastard son of the royal house of France, the falling Carlovingian house, aspired to the dignity. The bastardy was a Arnulf of Rheims. blot in the ecclesiastical escutcheon, but might be washed off by the mystical sacramental power of the

¹ Curious notices of books, especially of science, as well as historical facts, are scattered throughout Gerbert's letters; but they sadly want a critical editor.

² On the election of Hugh Capet, read the speech of Archbishop Adalbero, repudiating the notion of hereditary *right* to the crown. — Richer.

³ "Taceo de me, cui nullæ (mille) mortes intendebantur; et quod pater noster Adalbero me successorem sibi designaverat, cum totius cleri, et omnium episcoporum, ac *quorundam* militum favore." — Epist. cl. ii.

Church.¹ Hugh Capet, from some unknown policy, supported the pretensions of Arnulf: he appeared at Rheims, and though he affected to leave the free election to the clergy and people, disguised not his own inclinations. Arnulf's oath of fidelity to Hugh Capet, couched in terms of more than usual severity of imprecation, has been preserved by a contemporary writer.² Arnulf took the sacrament on this oath, and observed it—a few months. Arnulf was seized with compassion for his own despoiled and injured house. Hugh Capet became a usurper. The gates of Rheims were opened to Charles of Lorraine, the head of the Carolingian party. The archbishop at first pretended total ignorance of his own act; he was at length compelled to throw off the mask. Gerbert, also, had discovered the wrongs of the Carolingian house.³ He is become, as though indispensable in that office, the secretary of Arnulf, as he had been of Adalbero. In a letter to Bishop Adalberon or Ascelin, of Laon, he addresses him as his dear friend, and acknowledges how deeply he is mingled up with plots, conspiracies, litigations, secular affairs. "Why should this wrong be inflicted

¹ "Sed tamen hæc mater ecclesia purificans mysticis abluit sacramentis." See the proclamation of Arnulf, written by Gerbert, Epist. ii. 1. Hugh Capet does not seem to consider the bastardy a blot: he commends Arnulf to the citizens of Rheims as "*divæ memoriæ Lotharii ex concubinâ filius.*" — Richer, Lib. iv.

² "Quod ei imprecatur pro felicibus contumeliosa, pro salutaribus pernicioſa, pro honestis turpia, pro diuturnitate punctum, pro honore contemptum; et, ut totum concludatur, pro omnibus bonis omnia mala." — Richer. This valuable work of Richer was first discovered and published by Pertz. It has been reëdited and translated by the Historical Society of Paris.

³ "Patruo igitur miserescibat; illum cogitabat; illum colebat; illum pro parentibus carissimum habebat, apud quem collato consilio quærebat quonam modo in culmen honoris provehere possit, sic tamen ut ipse regis desertor non appareret."

on the elder house? why is it dispossessed of the throne?"¹

King Hugh Capet sent ambassadors to Rome to demand the deposition of the perfidious and rebellious Arnulf. Heribert, Prince of Vermandois, with Charles of Lorraine, the chief of the Carlovingian faction, appeared in person on the other side. Heribert brought more cogent arguments; it was not only a beautiful white pallfrey which he presented to the Pope, but more solid gifts in other quarters, to Crescentius, Lord of Rome. The ambassadors of King Hugh stood unhonored and unheard at the doors of the Vatican. Gerbert was in dire perplexity. With unconscious effrontery he confides his own double dealing to his friend the Archbishop of Treves. He had pledged himself to King Hugh; he trembled at the power of Charles of Lorraine, still, with Arnulf, master of Rheims. But on the side of Hugh Capet were the offers of the education of his son Robert, and the archiepiscopate.² He sent his letter of repudiation to Arnulf, yet with strange simplicity he entreated Arnulf to take under his special care certain houses which he

*Difficulties
of Gerbert.*

¹ "O felix quondam et dulcis amice sub imperio patris mei Adalberonis! . . . Ille ego qui sub imperio beatæ memoriæ patris mei Adalberonis militaveram in scholâ omnium virtutum. Nunc regiam incolo aulam, cum sacerdotibus Dei vitæ verba conferar (conferam?). Nec ob amorem Karoli aut Arnulfi diutius passus sum fieri organum diaboli . . . pro mendacio."

² "Pervenit, beatissime Pater, gladius usque ad animam. Hinc fide promissi Regibus Francorum urgemur, hinc potestate Principis Karoli, regnum ad se revocantis adducti, permutare dominos aut exules fieri cogimur." — Epist. xiv. In another letter; "Dicimus tacenda, tacemus dicenda; agimus quod volumus, quod volumus nequimus." — Epist. xi. He consoles himself that he never actually *swore* allegiance but to the Emperor Otho: "Nulli mortalium unquam aliquando juris jurandum præbui nisi D. M. Othoni."

had built in Rheims.¹ He had now discovered that Arnulf had been raised by simoniacal, and therefore heretical means. Arnulf's apostasy from his lord the king reveals all his diabolical wickedness. Gerbert becomes aware that Arnulf was a plunderer, a spoiler, not an administrator of the See. Gerbert's perceptions A.D. 989. may have been quickened by the synod of French bishops at Senlis, which declared the monk priest Adalgar, who had opened the gates of Rheims to Charles of Lorraine, under the ban of the Church and the Bishops of Rheims and Laon out of communion.

The betrayal of Arnulf by Adalberon of Laon into the hands of King Hugh Capet is a scene of treachery and impiety unparalleled even in those days. Adalberon, as Gerbert's letter shows, had been but now on the Carolingian side. He was the prelate accused of adulterous intercourse with Emma, wife of King Lothair; now his widow, it was asserted by some, through poison administered by her episcopal paramour.² Charles of Lorraine and Arnulf the Archbishop were committed to several prisons.

King Hugh Capet waited not his tardy, it might be Council of Rheims. July 17, 991. unsuccessful, appeal to Rome. A council was instantly summoned in the monastery of St. Basolus at Rheims. The Archbishops of Sens and Bourges, eleven bishops, a great number of abbots took their seats; they sate as feudal nobles, as well as

¹ "Libellus repudii." — Epist. xxiv.

² It is just to observe that Richer relates the death of Lothair as natural. See also the pathetic letter of Queen Emma to the Empress Adelheid: "My hope was in my son (Louis le Fainéant, now dethroned by Hugh Caput); he is become my enemy. . . . They have invented infamous charges against the Bishop of Laon." — Richer, iv. 61.

prelates of the Church, to adjudge the crime of treason as well as to depose the Metropolitan. The long formal procedure for the degradation of Arnulf contrasts with the easy and rapid transference of the kingly power from the Carolingian to the Capetian dynasty. To depose an Archbishop of Rheims was an affair of difficulty and intricacy, compared with the dethronement of a king of France.¹

Arnulf beheld confronted before him Adelgar the priest who had opened the gates of Rheims to Charles of Lorraine. Adelgar swore that the keys had been confided to him for the express purpose of the treason by the Archbishop. "Whoso believes me not on my word, I am ready to satisfy by the ordeal of fire, by boiling water, or red-hot iron." Bishop Guido of Soissons bore witness against the Metropolitan. A more revolting, a nameless charge was brought against the falling prelate by Rayner, his private secretary. Arnulf shuddered: he was permitted to retire with the Archbishop of Sens and three bishops. These prelates returned to the council, declaring that Arnulf, smitten in the conscience by God, had fallen at their feet, confessed his sins, and acknowledged that he ought rightfully to be deposed from the dignity which he had unworthily assumed. The other prelates were not content without being witnesses of his humiliation. Nor were they satisfied with this; they brought him before the people; they forced him to stammer out his consent to his own degradation. Nor was this all: they

¹ The acts of the Council of Rheims were drawn up by Gerbert. Baronius pours forth a torrent of indignation against him, whom even the papal dignity does not exculpate from the sin of having presumed to deny or to limit the pontifical power in this Council.

would preclude the reversal of their sentence by bold anticipative defiance of the interposition of Rome. Arnulf, Bishop of Orleans, in the name of the king, delivered doubtless in the words of Gerbert, a long elaborate harangue, which amounted to the renunciation of all allegiance to the pope; the declaration of independence, if not of superiority to the Italian pontiff. It spoke, as Gerbert might justly speak in all the pride of preëminent science and learning, of the profound ignorance of Rome. "There is not one at Rome, it is notorious, who knows enough of letters to qualify him for a door-keeper; with what face shall he presume to teach, who has never learned?" It spoke of the gross venality of Rome. "If King Hugh's ambassadors could have bribed the pope and Crescentius, his affairs had taken a different turn." It recounted the revolting crimes which for the last many years had sullied the papacy; the crimes of John XII. (Octavian), who had cut off the nose and the tongue of John the Cardinal; of Boniface, who had caused John XIII. to be strangled, and starved John XIV. to death in the dungeons of the Castle of St. Angelo. "To such monsters, full of all infamy, void of all knowledge, human and divine, are all the priests of God to submit; men distinguished throughout the world for their learning and holy lives? The Roman pontiff who so sins against his brother, who often admonished refuses to hear the voice of counsel, is as a publican and sinner. Though he be seated on a lofty throne, glittering with purple and gold; if he be thus without charity, thus puffed up by vain knowledge, is he not Anti-Christ? He is an image, an idol, whom to consult is to consult a stone."¹ Towards the close,

Speech of
Arnulf of
Orleans.

¹ Concil. Remens. sub ann. 991.

the Bishop of Orleans speaks with a kind of lofty compassion, and vouchsafes as it were a few words of reserved respect for Rome. "Worthy, or unworthy, we will respect her edicts, if the welfare of the realm be not thereby endangered." Significant words follow: "She has already lost the allegiance of the East; Alexandria, Antioch, Africa, and Asia are separate from her; Constantinople has broken loose from her. The interior of Spain (here we recognize Gerbert) knows nothing of the Pope." The orator not obscurely applies those titles, under which the Pope was long after designated by his foes; he is not only Anti-Christ, but also "the Man of Sin, the Mystery of Iniquity." Had visions crossed the bold mind of Gerbert of a kind of Transalpine papacy at Rheims? If so, disappointment came upon him with his greatness. For the council, not content with the degradation of Arnulf, placed Gerbert on the vacant cathedral throne.

The form of Gerbert's election is remarkable. It is by the bishops, who complain that on a former occasion they were compelled by popular ^{Gerbert} clamor, popular clamor that once cried, "Crucify him, crucify him!" to make an unworthy choice. It was no boy whom they now deliberately chose, but a man of mature age, known to them from his youth; of profound learning and piety. Gerbert's confession of faith is still more extraordinary. On the Trinity, and other points of doctrine, it is elaborately orthodox. He adds: "I prohibit not marriage; I condemn not second marriages. I do not blame the eating of flesh. I acknowledge that reconciled penitents should be admitted to communion. All sins original, as well as voluntary, are washed away by baptism. I believe n

one can be saved out of the Catholic church. I confirm the four great councils.”¹

Gerbert had been advanced, unwillingly, if his own words are to be credited, to the archiepiscopal see. But his election was unpopular; the people were indignant at the bishops assuming the election; the severity of his morals offended the looser clergy; the want of birth was an inexpiable delinquency with the high-born prelates. He was accused as having betrayed, imprisoned his master, and violated his spouse, that is, usurped his church.² Adalberon, the perfidious Bishop of Laon, envied the advancement of Gerbert; to dethrone his rival he entered into negotiations with the German Court of Otho, from which Gerbert, by throwing himself into the interest of Hugh Capet, had undesignedly estranged himself. Theophania, the Greek Empress mother, was now dead; Adelheid, his grandmother, or the boy Emperor, Otho III., demanded a legate from Pope John XV. to reverse the iniquitous sentence pronounced against Arnulf, and the promotion of Gerbert. It was time for the Papal See, even at its lowest state of degradation, to assert its trembling authority, to assert that authority at the summons, and therefore under the protection of the imperial house of Saxony. Leo, the abbot of St. Boniface in Rome, appeared as the papal legate to adjudge this

Fall of
Gerbert.
A.D. 995.

A.D. 991.

¹ Gfrörer, with his customary too great ingenuity, makes out of this convenient adulation to the family of Hugh Capet a design to throw off the Pope, and assert the absolute independence of the Gallican Church. The clergy were to be won by the permission of marriage. It reads to me more like a renunciation of Manicheism, which Gerbert may have thought necessary or expedient. — Gfrörer, p. 1462.

² “Ut major fiat invidia, obloquitur, Dominum tuum tradidisti, carceri mancipasti, sponsam ejus rapuisti, sedem pervasisti.”

great cause, conjointly with the Bishops of France and Germany.

On the first menace of the papal interference, the French prelates, who met at a place called Chela, seemed resolute in the assertion of their liberties. But the papal legate was a man of courage and ability equal to the occasion. The Roman abbot Leo promulgated an answer to the harangue of the Bishop of Orleans at Rheims.¹ This remarkable document (but lately come to light) strikes in its outset at Gerbert as the author of the speech of the Bishop of Orleans at Rheims. “The acts of your synod, which have been delivered to me, fill me with abhorrence. Truly is the word of the Lord fulfilled in you, ‘There shall be many anti-Christ’s;’ so know we that the last day is at hand. Christ, who cannot lie, has said that the blessed Peter is the foundation of your churches, yet say your anti-Christ’s that in Rome there is now but a temple of idols, an image of stone. Because the vicars of Peter and their disciples will not have for their teachers a Plato, a Virgil, a Terence, and the rest of the herd of Philosophers, who soar aloft like the birds of the air, or dive into the depths like the fishes of the sea; ye say that they are not worthy to be doorkeepers, because they know not how to make verses. Peter is indeed a doorkeeper — but of heaven.” Thus abbot Leo repels the charge of ignorance; to that of gross venality his answer is certainly not that of Italian address. “Did not the Saviour receive gifts of the wise men?” He does not deny the crimes charged

¹ It has been published by Pertz. *Monumenta Germaniæ*, iii. 686. — Hoeck’s Life of Gerbert was written before the publication of this, and of Richer.

against Popes, but urges the warning example of Ham, accursed for uncovering his father's nakedness. He asserts that the prerogative of the See of Rome is from God himself; it cannot be annulled, or transferred to any other see. To the asseveration of the revolt of Asia, Africa, and Spain from the Roman See, he avers that it is utterly false, and declares that ambassadors from Alexandria, Jerusalem, Carthage, Cordova, have but lately paid homage, and consulted the See of Rome.

Whether through the presence or the arguments of the papal legates, or the countenance of the Court of A.D. 995. Otho, or the interests or the apprehensions of Hugh Capet of France (he died the next year), Gerbert stood alone at Moisson before a synod of but a few German prelates,¹ Ludolf of Treves, Notkar of Liege, Siegfried of Munster, Haimo of Verdun. The A.D. 996. papal legate sat in the centre. The Bishop of Verdun, as understanding it might seem alone among these Teutonic bishops, the Gaulish (the Roman tongue), opened the session. Gerbert made an eloquent speech, but to an adverse court. The legate pronounced the sentence of interdict from communion, and from the exercise of his episcopal functions. Gerbert boldly overwhelmed them with citations from the canons, that such interdict against a man convicted of no crime was illegal. The council adjourned the final decree.

Gerbert contemplated further resistance. The future Pope, in a letter to the Archbishop of Sens utters these un-Roman doctrines, — "Rome cannot make lawful that which God condemns, nor condemn that which God has made lawful. Rome cannot expel from her

¹ Concilium Moisson., compared with the last chapters of Richer.

communion him who is convicted of no crime. The papal decrees are only of force when they concur with the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Prophets, and the genuine canons of the Church.”¹

But deserted by all, shunned as under interdict,² he thought it wisest at length to bow before the storm. He retired from France to the court of the Emperor Otho. There, however, degraded from his archiepiscopate, it might seem through the imperial interest, Gerbert ceased not to be the most distinguished ecclesiastic for knowledge and erudition north of the Alps, perhaps in Christendom. He resumed all his old honor and respect; the court of Otho was proud of his presence; the spell of his powerful mind was cast on the young and ambitious Otho. One step towards the height of power had been made, and he had fallen back; he was ere long to make the other two.³

We return from this long but necessary episode, the life of Gerbert, to the magnificent schemes of Otho III. for the restoration of the empire in its transcendent Cæsarean power to Rome; of the popedom in its boundless, but strictly spiritual dignity.

Gerbert was now again free to follow with undivided devotion the fortunes of the Imperial House. France had cast him off: he was the vassal of Otho. He joined the great assemblage of pre-

Gerbert,
Archbishop
of Ravenna.
A.D. 998.

¹ Epistol. Arch. Senonen.

² Compare his letter to the Empress Adelheid: “Memini enim meos conspirasse non solum milites, sed et clericos, ut nemo mecum comederet, nemo sacris interesset.”—Epist. c. 411. A third rival candidate for the archiepiscopate was in the field, Gebuin.

³ Read the skillful letter to the Emperor Otho: “Scio me divinitatem in multis offendisse et offendere. . . . Tribus ut ita dicam sæculi ætatibus vobis, patri, avo, inter hostes et tela fidem purissimam exhibui.”—Epist. xxx. The famous lines are ascribed to Gerbert himself. Scandit ad R. (Rheims) Gerbertus, ad R. (Ravenna) Post, Papa viget R. (Rome).

ates, and accompanied his imperial master to Italy. There the Archbishop of Ravenna having retired to monastic seclusion, Gerbert, though a Transalpine, was raised at once to the second see of Italy.¹ On the death of Gregory V. Otho could find no prelate so likely to enter into, or to carry out (if Gerbert's influence had not first suggested, and constantly kept alive) his magnificent visions, as the man who stood alone as the most eminent prelate of his age, in learning peerless, in piety unimpeachable, Gerbert of Ravenna. Gerbert took the significant name of Silvester II., the new Silvester of the new Constantine.

Gerbert
Pope.
April, 999.

The decree for the election of Gerbert issued by the Emperor develops the designs of Otho and of his Pope. In the name of the Holy Trinity, Otho the servant of the Apostles, by the will of God the Saviour, Emperor of the Romans: "We declare Rome to be the capital of the world, the Roman Church the mother of the churches; but the dignity of the Roman Church has been obscured by her neglectful and ignorant pontiffs; they have alienated the property of the Church without the city to the dregs of mankind² (these were the feudatory princes of the Roman States), made every thing venal, and so despoiled the very altars of the apostles. These prelates have thrown all law into confusion; they have endeavored to retrieve their own dilapidations by

¹ Gregory V. grants the pall to Gerbert, as Archbishop of Ravenna, April 28, 998.

² See the comminatorium of Gerbert to the neighboring barons, whom he accuses of slaying priests, robbing the Church and the poor. — Epist. ii. xli. Gerbert had the high satisfaction of magnanimously condescending, as Pope, to reinvest his old rival Arnulf in his full archiepiscopal rights and honors. — Epist. ii. lv. Dec. 999.

the spoliation of us; they have abandoned their own rights to usurp those of the empire." He denounces the donations of Constantine and Charlemagne as prodigal and unwise; he assumes the power not merely of electing, but by God's grace of creating and ordaining the Pope. Finally, he grants eight counties to the Pope — Pesaro, Fano, Senigaglia, Ancona, Fossambruno, Osimo, Cagli, and Iesi.¹

But ungrateful Rome seemed loth to enter into the lofty schemes of the Emperor for her aggrandizement; the presence and the power of the ^{Rome} revolts. Emperor did not overawe her conflicting factions. The feudatory nobles of the neighborhood might well resent the denunciations and suspect the power of their new lord. Tibur broke out in rebellion; the lord of that city was the kinsman of Crescentius and the ancestor of that line of counts who in the next century created and unmade popes. Tibur was compelled to yield to the overpowering force of Otho: but on his return to Rome Otho found the gates closed. He ascended a tower near the walls, addressed the people in the prophetic language of expostulation, reminded them of his attachment, of his plans for their aggrandizement. They yielded probably rather to the terror of his arms than to the force of his eloquence. The gates were opened, and again they swore allegiance to their irresistible sovereign. But at this very moment the dire tragedy was hastening to its close. No Nemesis more awful ever darkened the stage of Greece. *Stephania*. *Stephania*, the wife of Crescentius, had, on his fall,

¹ The decree names only seven: Pisaurum, Fanum, Senigalliam, Anconam, Fossimbronum, Gallihesem, Ausinum. Is the last but one, made out of Cagli and Iesi?

been abandoned to the brutal lust of the German soldiers.¹ With stern self-command she suppressed her indignation, her loathing, within her heart. At the end of three years she had nursed up her fatal beauty to its old exquisite lustre. Otho himself, the religious Otho, was caught in her toils, which she spread with consummate art. She scrupled not to ascend the bed of her husband's murderer. With Stephania vengeance was cheaply bought at such a price. She feigned the passionate love of a mistress, till the opportunity came of administering a subtle poison.² In Italy such poisons were too well known, and here there seems convincing evidence to the truth of this crime, throughout Italian history always suspected, always credited, yet rarely with stronger proof than suspicion. The hand of death was upon the bright, hopeful youth. He withdrew from Rome, either expelled by a new insurrection secretly guided by Gregory of Tusculum, or with his constitution shattered by the poison administered through the hand of Stephania: he withdrew, not to collect his faithful troops and crush the rebellious city, but as a penitent, to deplore and expiate his sins. His countenance was still cheerful to his faithful adherents; but his time was spent in tears, in prayer, in almsgiving. Already had he made a pilgrimage in the

¹ "Stephania autem uxor ejus traditur adulteranda Teutonicis." — Arnulf, c. 12. Höfler kills her of this ill-usage.

² "Incidit in insidiās mulieris malæ, cujus virum Crescentium jusserat capitalem subire sententiam, quam formæ elegantissimæ nimis insipienter thoro suo socians, ab eâ veneno intra cubiculum dormians, infectus est." — Vit. S. Meinwerici apud Leibnitz, i. p. 521. Compare Ann. Saxo. Leo Ostiens., Landulf senior, Radulph. Glaber. The modern German writers, zealous for the honor of Otho, seem inclined to doubt this story. Muratori accepts it. It seems to me to rest on as good authority as most events of the time.

preceding year to atone for his perfidious execution of the Consul Crescentius, and his cruelty to Pope John XIV. Heaven, it is to be hoped, was more merciful than the wife of Crescentius. Deeply must Otho, cut off at the age of twenty-two years, have rued his fatal connection with Rome, which neither terror could control, nor the hopes of her restoration to glory propitiate to a Transalpine sovereign. The world, especially the Transalpine world, deplored the untimely fate of this promising prince, who seemed destined for nobler ends. Rome might seem to crown her wickedness by this last unequalled crime.¹

¹ Höfler has published a curious popular poem on the death of Otho and the election of Henry II. The following are stanzas:

“ Quis dabit aquam capiti?
 Quis succurret pauperi?
 Quis dabit fontes oculis?
 Lacrymosis populis
 Sufficientes lacrymæ (as)
 Mala mundi plangere?
 Ad triumphum ecclesiæ
 Cœpit Otto crescere:
 Sumsit Otto imperium
 Ut floreret sæculum:
 Vivo Ottone tertio
 Salus fuit populo.
 * * * *
 Plangat ignitus Oriens,
 Crudus ploret Occidens:
 Sit Aquilo in cinere,
 Planctus in Meridie.
 Sit mundus in tristitiâ,
 Nostra luge cithara.
 Plangat mundus, plangat Roma,
 Lugent Ecclesia.
 Sit nullum Romæ canticum,
 Ululet palatium.
 Sub Cæsaris absentia
 Sunt turbata sæcula.”

Beitrage, xvi. p. 381

On the other hand Bonizo, the Bishop of Sutri, expressing no doubt a

The faithful Pope Silvester had followed the Emperor in his retreat from Rome; he returned to Rome after his death. But Gerbert had seen three generations of Saxon Emperors expire in sad succession: the next year he followed them to the tomb.¹ Popular rumor attributed, if not his death, yet a grievous malady, to the same remorseless Stephania. He is said to have lost his voice by poison, which she contrived to have administered to him.² Such were the crimes believed in those days to be perpetrated, if not actually perpetrated, on holy popes and on Emperors. All the magic art which fame attributed to Gerbert furnished no antidote. But Pope Silvester, throughout the following ages, was remembered with a kind of awful misgiving, with shuddering horror, lest the throne of St. Peter should have been occupied by a necromancer, by one whose wonderful powers could only have been attained through a compact with the Evil One.³

strong Italian feeling of the time, condemns Otho to hell, for his cruelty to Pope John of Ravenna: "*Domino odibilis sine viatico vitam finivit . . . Quo mortuo et in infernum sepulto.*" — *Liber ad Amic.* iv.

¹ Otho died Jan. 22, 1002; Silvester, May 12, 1003.

² "*Veneficio ejusdem mulieris etiam Papa Romanus gravatus asseritur; ita ut loquendi usum amiserit.*" — *Ann. Saxo.*

³ William of Malmesbury is full on the magical arts and enchantments of Gerbert. He stole his book of glamour; his miserable death is the indubitable proof that the accusations of magic and doing homage to the devil are true (pp. 275, 284). Such was the belief in remote Britain. A more brief funeral oration cannot be imagined than that in the *Vit. Pontif. Ravennat*: "*Ilomagium diabolo fecit et male finivit.*" — p. 207.

But compare *Hist. Lit. de la France* and Vincent of Beauvais in the *Encyclopædia of the Middle Ages*. Gerbert in Spain, the land of necromancers, fell in love with the daughter of one of those accursed doctors: he stole his books. The magician, by the aid of the stars, pursued the robber. But Gerbert too had learned to read the stars. By their counsel he lay hid under a bridge, through the arches of which rushed the roaring waters. The devil descended, and bore him away on his wings beyond the sea; with the design of establishing at a future time

by an awful delusion, one of his own abhorred supporters on the chair of the chief apostle.

Modern readers will be more struck with wonder at Gerbert's organ, which went by *steam*: "Ipse Gerbertus fecit arte mechanicâ horologium et organa hydraulica, ubi mirum in modum, per aquæ calefactæ violentiam, implet ventus emergens concavitatem barbati (barbiti?) et per multos foratiles tractus æreæ fistulæ modulatos clamores emittunt." — Vincent Bellov. Spec. Hist. xxiv. c. 98.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TUSCULAN POPES.

THE first attempt to rescue the papacy from the hands of the turbulent patricians or fierce populace of Rome, to open to the whole Western Church the appointment to the supreme headship of Western Christendom, had ended in failure. Nearly another half century must elapse before Transalpine Christendom, by asserting her right of supplanting a line of degenerate Italian pontiffs by men more worthy of the high office, shall compel Italy, in her turn, to bring forth and to train men who, through their commanding abilities, win back the lost tiara, and revenge Italy for her temporary obscurity by reducing beneath her feet the rebellious Teutonic Church and even the Western Empire.

Three undistinguished popes, John XVII., who lived less than six months after his election, Popes John XVIII., and Sergius IV., ruled for ten John XVII. John XVIII. Sergius IV. years of obscurity.¹ The contest for the kingdom between Ardoïn, Marquis of Ivrea, whom the Italians had chosen on the death of Otho, and the Emperor Henry II., was decided in the north of Italy. All the great prelates of the north espoused the impe-

¹ John XVII., June 13, Dec. 7, 1003; John XVIII., Dec. 25, 1003, June, 1009; Sergius, July, 1009, died 1012, June 16.

rial interest¹—Tibald, Marquis and Archbishop of Ravenna, the Bishops of Modena, Verona, and Vercelli openly maintained, the Archbishop of Milan, the Bishops of Cremona, Piacenza, Pavia, Brescia, and Como hardly disguised their inclinations to, the same cause. The Pope alone seems to have stood aloof in unregarded insignificance. Rome, abandoned to herself, had resumed her republican constitution. The family of Crescentius had risen again to power. John, the son of the beheaded consul,² whether through the prevailing interest of Stephania, or by the solicitude of Otho to win popularity in Rome, had been created prefect of the city under the Emperor. On Otho's death he assumed the title of Patrician, and ruled the city and the Popes with arbitrary power.³

But adverse as it may be safely conjectured, and rival to the lineal descendant of Crescentius, ^{Counts of} had risen the Counts of Tusculum. These ^{Tusculum.} counts were also descended from Marozia and Alberic, and closely connected, being a younger branch of the same family, with the house of Crescentius. The Counts of Tusculum had resisted Otho III. in the zenith of his power. A strong faction in Rome were jealous of the Tusculans, and reproached Otho for his blind clemency in not razing to the ground that dangerous and rebellious fortress, which was in too close neighborhood to Rome. Possibly a temporary junction between these two great rival houses led to the perilous state of things, which induced the dying Otho to leave the impracticable, if not insurgent city. The Counts of

¹ Adelbert in Vit. S. Henrici.

² See the genealogy in Höfler.

³ "Destructor Apostolicæ sedis." — Thietmar, A.D. 1012

Emperor.¹ Nevertheless the coronation took place.² Henry displayed and exercised all the rights of sovereignty, coined money with his own superscription, and administered justice in his own name. Benedict ruled in peace. John Crescentius still held the office of Prefect of the city; Alberic, the brother of July, 1014. the Pope, was Consul and Senator.³ Yet even from a Crescentius, described as son of Count Benedict, the Pope wrested estates, which, when Consul, the Crescentius had seized, belonging to the famous monastery of Farfa. The spoiler was summoned before the Pope's tribunal; for Benedict wanted neither ability nor courage, at least that of a secular prince. By his activity and personal prowess a powerful armament of Saracens, which had landed in the territory of Pisa at Luna, was attacked and cut off almost to a man. The king only escaped; the queen was taken; her head-dress of gold and jewels, worth 1000 pounds, was sent as a present by the Pope to the Emperor Henry. The indignant Saracen, it is said, sent a large bag of chest- A D. 1016. nuts to the Pope, with a billet, "I will return with as many valiant Saracens to the conquest of Italy." The undaunted Pope sent him back a bag of millet. "As many brave warriors as there are grains will appear at my bidding to defend their native land."⁴ The Pope

¹ "Apostolicæ sedis destructor, muneribus suis et promissionibus phaleratis regem palam honoravit, sed Imperatoriæ dignitatis fastigium eum ascendere multum timuit, omnimodisque id prohibere clam tentavit."—Thietmar, 1014.

² The coronation the 24th or 14th of Feb. Muratori, sub ann. 14 Feb. Jaffé.

³ Compare a Placitum published by Mabillon, Ann. Benedict. sub ann. 1016.

⁴ Thietmar, vii. 81. Muratori conjectures the king to have been Mugello, who had possession of Sardinia. His summons to the troops was "ut ini-

more than maintained his lofty language: his legate was sent to Pisa and to Genoa, urging those cities, now rising into mercantile importance and power, not to endure the possession of an Italian island by the unbeliever. The united forces of these two cities expelled the Saracens from Sardinia, but they quarrelled about the spoil. The Pisan annalist claims the investiture of the island by the Pope for his city, which retained the sovereignty.¹ Benedict maintained his amicable relations with the Emperor Henry II.

Defeat of Saracens by the Pope. A.D. 1020. The Pope visited the Emperor at Bamberg, during the next year the Emperor descended into Italy. The Pope and the Emperor had a common enemy, the Greeks of Apulia and the south of Italy. The Greeks, seconded by the Prince of Capua and some of the southern chieftains, had taken the aggressive; in possession of Capua they would have threatened Rome herself. A.D. 1021. At this time Rodolf, a Norman, with some few followers, half adventurers driven from their native lands, half pilgrims to the shrine of the apostles, appeared at Rome. The martial Pope enlisted them in his cause, and garrisoned with them the strong fortress on the Garigliano; the forces of the Emperor overran Apulia. His general, Poppone, Archbishop of Aquileia, besieged and took Capua; the prince was at the mercy of Henry, who hardly respected a safe-conduct given by the Archbishop of Cologne. Troja, after an obstinate siege, surrendered. Henry was prepared to wreak his revenge on the city: he was melted to tears by a saintly hermit coming forth from the gates

micos Christi secum circumferant." The Pope claimed the queen's head-dress, the "*spolia opina, aurum capitale, ejusdem (reginæ) ornamentum* Papa sibi præ ceteris vindicavit."

¹ *Annali Pisani*, p. 107.

with the children of the city in procession, chanting Kyrie Eleison! The Emperor and the Pope visited together the monastery of Monte Casino. The Emperor was relieved from excruciating pains, which he was suffering, by the intercession of St. Benedict: he rewarded the saint by ample donations to the monastery.¹

On the death of Benedict VIII., the Tusculan house by the same quiet but unresisted influence, undisguised bribery, elevated the brother of Benedict, a Jan. 28, 1022. layman and prefect of the city, to the papal throne.² The Emperor Henry II. died in the course of the same year. For nine uneventful years the power John XIX. which had created, maintained John XIX. Aug. 1, 1022, to April 7, 1029. in peaceable possession of the papal throne. Between three and four years elapsed before Henry III., the son and successor of Henry II., could journey to Conrad the Rome to receive the Imperial crown. His Saxic. coronation was the important affair of the Pontificate of John. It was attended (so great was still the reverence for Rome in the remoter parts of Europe) by two pilgrim kings, present to behold the eternal city, and to do homage to the chair, to the religion, to the March 26, successor of St. Peter. These were Rudolf 1027. III. of Burgundy, and Canute the Danish King of

¹ Radulf. Glaber. The *religious* Pope, with the *religious* Emperor, at a synod at Pavia, passed decrees strictly prohibiting the growing usage of the marriage of the clergy; no clerk might have wife or concubine; no bishop have a female in his dwelling; the sons and daughters of clerks were slaves of the Church; anathema on him who adjudges them to be free. — Pertz, Leges, ii. 561.

² “Uno eodemque die et laicus et pontifex fuit.” — Romualdæ. Salern. Chron. S. Muratori, II. It. vii. “Qui uno eodemque die præfectus fuit et Papa.” This clause had been erased, but was restored in the MS. of Bonizo.

England. The ceremony did not pass off without a tumult. A fierce fray took place between the barbarous and undisciplined Germans and the turbulent Romans; it ended in a great slaughter of the Romans. The leaders were compelled to appear before the haughty Emperor in the garb of penitents, with naked feet; the free men with their swords unsheathed, the slaves with osier cords round their necks, as if deserving to be hanged.¹ Another tumult more characteristic broke out between two Eriberts, archbishops of Ravenna and Milan. Each claimed the privilege of standing at the right hand of the Emperor. The decision, as might be expected, was against the Prelate of Ravenna, the old traditionary antagonist of the Pope. Eribert of Ravenna boldly took the place; the Prelate of Milan wished to avoid an open rupture; the Emperor, by the advice of the Pope, withdrew his hand from that of the Archbishop, and summoned the Bishop of Vercelli to his right hand. But Eribert of Ravenna still persisted in his right: the followers of the two archbishops came to blows, and the Ravennese was obliged to fly. A council asserted the right of the Archbishop of Milan, but Ravenna defied the decree both of Pope and council.

The hereditary papacy in the House of Tusculum, Jan 1033. if it had debased the Holy See by men of rapacity and violence, had yet maintained the peace of Rome for twenty years, and their Popes as secular princes had not been wanting in energy and vigor. Now as though their object had been to reduce it to the lowest contempt, or as if, although the older and more able branches of the family disdained or would not sub-

¹ Wippo, Vit. Conrad Salici.

mit even to the outward restraints of the office, nevertheless they would not allow the dignity to depart from their house ; by their irresistible gold they secured the Pontificate for a boy not more than ten or twelve years old, the nephew of his predecessors, Benedict and John.¹

Benedict IX. had all the vices of a youth born to uncontrolled power ; the Papacy had to en- Benedict IX. dure the evils without the counteracting advantages of hereditary monarchy. In Italy, more especially in Rome, this transmission of the grace of the priesthood, or the spiritual power of the Supreme Pontificate through the worst and most licentious of mankind, seemed to jar on no strong religious sensitiveness, to rouse no general remonstrance of indignation. No vice could interrupt the descent of power imparted, according to its own proper theory, for the extirpation of vice : so entirely had that which was outward and formal prevailed over the inward and moral conception of Christianity. Beyond the Alps, at least in the remoter parts of Western Christendom, the individual Pope was merged in his office. The revolutions in Rome disturbed not the ideal sanctity with which the religious imagination arrayed the successor of St. Peter. In some cases the writers in Germany, though ecclesiastics, seem to have been ignorant of the name of the ruling Pope. For twelve years Benedict IX., under the protection of his powerful kindred, ruled in Rome, in the words of one of his successors, Victor III., leading a life so shameful, so foul, and execrable, that he

¹ "Puer ferme decennis, intercedente thesaurorum pecuniâ, electus extitit a Romanis." — Radolfus Glaber, iv. c. 5.

shuddered to describe it.¹ He ruled like a captain of banditti, rather than a prelate. Adulteries, homicides perpetrated by his own hand, passed unnoticed, unrevenged; for the patrician of the city, Gregory, was the brother of the Pope: another brother, Peter, an active partisan. Once, according to one doubtful authority, he had been already expelled, but replaced by the Emperor Conrad the Salic.² The oppressed people at length grew weary of his robberies, murders, and abominations. They rose and drove him from the city, and

A.D. 1044.
April 10.

proceeded to the election of John Bishop of Sabina, who took the name of Silvester III. But they had sold themselves to the Tusculan tyranny, and were not permitted to shake it off; the Consuls were partisans, doubtless kindred of the Pope; Benedict returned in triumph; the anti-Pope retired in disgrace and excommunicated to his bishopric. Benedict himself grew weary of his office, or despaired of maintaining it, or perhaps put it up to auction with no intent of fulfilling the contract. According to another by no means inconceivable story,³ he was deeply enamoured of his cousin, the daughter of Gerard de Saxo (of the rock), master perhaps of some strong hill fortress. The

Sale of the
Papacy.
Gregory VI.

father refused his daughter, unless the Pope would surrender the papacy. He actually sold the papacy to an arch-Presbyter, named John,⁴ of

¹ "Benedictus ille nomine, non factis, cujusdam Alberici filius (Magi potius Simonis, quam Simonis Petri vestigia sectatus) non parvâ a Patre in populum profligatâ pecuniâ, summum sibi sacerdotium vindicavit. Cujus quidem post adeptum sacerdotium vita quam turpis, quam fœda, quam execranda extiterit, horresco referre." — Victor III., Dialog. lib. iii. apud Mabillon, Act. S. S. Benedict. sec. iv.

² Radolfus Glaber, sub ann. 1038.

³ Bonizo, ad Ann.

⁴ "Joanni Archipresbytero non parvâ ab eo acceptâ pecuniâ, summum

the same house, who assumed the name of Gregory VI. John, the arch-Presbyter, was a man of learning for his day, of unimpeachable chastity, now become in Rome so rare as to be called an angelic virtue. By his own admission he had heaped up enormous wealth, which he intended to dedicate to pious uses. Among these pious uses (according to this Didius Julianus of the Papacy) was his own advancement. Not only did he pay a large sum to Benedict himself, he confessed the purchase of the suffrages of the people; it was a pious use to restore the right of election to its lawful owners. Such acts ascribed to Gregory VI. throw some light on these times of darkness and confusion. It is natural to inquire into the sources of this enormous wealth by which the Counts of Tusculum had so long retained the Roman people in their pay. It is probable that the papacy was enslaved by its own wealth: that this powerful house had obtained by forcible or fraudulent alienation large parts of the estates of the Church. Gregory had bought the papacy; but it was not a barren and impoverished see which he coveted.¹ He devoted himself immediately to the recovery of the ecclesiastical possessions at the point of the sword; and to the suppression of another great source of revenue to the turbulent barons of Rome and the neighborhood, the plunder of the pilgrims to Rome. These pilgrims, who still flocked on with unwearied zeal to the Holy City,

sacerdotium tradidit." — Victor III., Dialog. lib. iii. "*Ejusdem pontificatus per cartulam refutavit Johanni suo patrino.*"

¹ It is strange enough to find Peter Damiani (he was but young) rejoicing in the accession of Gregory VI. as the future extirpator of simony. "*Latantur cœli . . . conteratur jam mille forme caput serpentis: cepit commercium perversæ negotiationis: nullam jam monetam falsarius Simon in ecclesia fabricet Dei.*" — Epist. i. 1. Compare Epist. ii.

arrived, instead of opulent and munificent votaries at the sacred shrines, miserable and plundered beggars. So entirely was Pope Gregory occupied in these achievements, that the Roman people gave him a colleague to officiate, when he was engaged in war within the Church.¹

There were now three Popes, by themselves or by Three Popes. their factions engaged in deadly feud. They had laid aside; or had taught each other to despise, their spiritual arms; they encountered with the carnal weapons of ordinary warfare. For Benedict had not obtained his bride; Gerard de Saxo had joined the faction of Silvester III. Benedict's brother would not brook the obscuraton of the house of Tusculum: they brought back, not unreluctant, the abdicated Pope and reinstated him on his throne. Benedict held the Lateran, Gregory Santa Maria Maggiore, Silvester St. Peter's and the Vatican.

Christendom could not longer be ignorant of, or endure this state of things. Peter the Archdeacon of Rome, commissioned by the vows and prayers of a great number of the clergy, the monks, and more devout people, crossed the Alps, and threw himself at the feet of the Emperor, imploring his succor. The Emperor Henry III. was called upon by his title to the Empire, by his own grave and religious character, by

¹ According to William of Malmesbury, on Roman affairs no high authority, these sanguinary occupations of the Pope disqualified him in the eyes of the Romans for his holy office. The Romans would have been the last to take offence at such exploits in a Pope. But a strong anti-Tusculan party may have felt so much interest in the recovery of the estates of the Church from those lawless barons, and in the security of the roads, by which the pilgrims might reach Rome with their wealth, that they may have acquiesced in the Pope's discharge of his sacred functions by a deputy.—William of Malmes lib. ii.

the open or the tacit summons of the pious throughout Europe, and even of those who respected the Church: he was implored, in popular verse, to dissolve this odious Trigamy of the Church,¹ and to interpose his irresistible authority. He crossed the Alps, and was received either with loud acclamations or with silent awe. At Piacenza, Gregory, supposing his own claims to the papacy irrefragable, ventured to meet him.² Henry gave no answer, but advanced to Sutri, about thirty miles north of Rome. There he assembled a Council of many prelates: among them were the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Bishop of Augsburg, and the Archbishop of Arles. In this Council he proceeded to examine the claims of the conflicting Popes. Sylvester was condemned at once as an usurper, and delivered up, degraded from his holy orders, to be imprisoned for life in a monastery. The voluntary abdication of Benedict annulled his claim.³ Gregory fondly thought that there was now no obstacle to his universal recognition. But he was called upon to give an account of his own election. He could not deny, he could not attempt to extenuate, the flagrant simony of those proceedings by which he had bought the papacy. He admitted his guilt, his disqualification, stripped off the pontifical robes, and intreating forgiveness, quietly surrendered up the papacy.⁴ He retired, not without compulsion, into a

A.D. 1046.
Dec. 20.

Degradation
of Benedict
IX. and
Gregory VI.

¹ "Una Sunamitis nupsit tribus maritis,
Rex Henrice, Omnipotentis vice,
Solve connubium triforme dubium."

² Some writers, summed up by Luden (*Geschichte der Deutschen*, vol. viii. p. 191), suppose a secret understanding between the Emperor and Pope Gregory.

³ "Maximè cum ipse, Romanus Pontifex, se judicaverit deponendum."

⁴ "Ego Gregorius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, propter turpissimam

monastery in Germany; his involuntary companion in his exile was no less than the famous Hildebrand.¹

venalitatem simoniacæ heræseos, quæ antiqui hostis versutiâ meæ electioni irrepsit, a Romano episcopatu judico me submovendum." — Bonizo. Victor in Dialog. lib. iii.

¹ Muratori, sub ann. 1046.

BOOK VI.—CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPES.	EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	PATRIARCHS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.	GERMAN EMPERORS.	KINGS OF FRANCE.
A.D. 1048 Clement II.	A.D. 1047	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1048 Damasus II.	Constantine Mo- nomachus 1054	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1048 Leo IX.	1054			
1054 Victor II.	1054 Theodora II.	1056	Henry III. 1056	
1057 Stephen IX.	1056 Michael VI.	1057	1056 Henry IV.	
1058 Benedict X.	1057 Isaac Com- nenus 1059			
1059 Nicholas II.	1059 Constantine Ducas 1068	1059 Constantine III. 1068		Henry I. 1061
1061 Alexander II.	1068 Romanus Diogenes 1071	1063 John Xiphilin 1076		1061 Philip I.
1073 Gregory VII.	1071 Michael VII.			

BOOK VI.



CHAPTER I.

THE GERMAN POPES.

THE evil of the degraded papacy lay deeper : it was absolutely necessary to rescue it entirely and forever from the Counts of Tusculum and the Barons of Rome. The only remedy was the appointment of a stranger. Murmurs were heard that no one could canonically be elected Pope who had not been ordained Deacon and Priest in the Church of Rome. The insulting language of the Germans was, that in the whole Church there was scarcely one who was not disqualified either as illiterate, or as tainted with simony, or as living in notorious concubinage.¹

Suidger, the Bishop of Bamberg, was consecrated Clement II. Pope at Sutri ; the first Pope consecrated out of Rome.² On the arrival of the Emperor at Rome, the usual appeal was made to the Roman people whether they knew one worthier to be Pope. The German sol-

¹ *Neminem ad Romanum debere ascendere pontificatum, qui non in eâdem ecclesiâ presbyter et diaconus.*—Bonizo, apud *Æfaliûm*. “*Ut in tantâ ecclesiâ vix unus reperiri potuit, quin vel illiteratus, vel simoniacus, vel esset concubinatus.*” Bonizo is a bad historian for the past, but an unexceptionable evidence of the violence of the Italian feelings against a German pope. Compare Leo Ostiens. and Victor III.

² So at least says Bonizo. Compare Herman. *Contract*. A.D. 1096.

diers stood around ; the people preserved an obsequious silence. The Bishop of Bamberg was led by Henry himself to the Papal throne : the people seemed to assent by their acclamations.¹ Suidger took the name of Clement II., the first, it might be hoped, of a new line of apostolic pontiffs, called after the immediate successor of St. Peter. Henry and his Empress Agnes received the imperial crown from the hands of the new Pope. The coronation was celebrated with unusual pomp and solemnity. The Pope exacted from the religious Emperor, not merely the most ^{Christmas, 1046.} full confession of faith, and the oath of fidelity and of protection to the Roman see, but of chastity, justice, humility, and charity. The Pope enforced on the Emperor, the Emperor with the most profound submission pledged himself in the face of heaven to observe these Christian virtues.²

The first act of reformation which the religious part of Christendom expected from the promotion of this blameless and holy stranger to the Roman see, was the summoning a Council at Rome to brand the all-prevailing vice of the times. Simony was con- ^{Jan. 1047.} demned in the strongest general terms and in all its various forms ; but even this Council was obliged to mitigate its censure. The severer bishops proposed the absolute degradation of any one of their order who had been guilty of this sacrilegious sin ; they were reduced to the melancholy confession, that the Church would be nearly

¹ If Benzo of Albi is to be believed, Henry told them to elect any one present. The Romans replied that in the presence of the Emperor the election was not according to their will: "Ubi adest presentia regis, non est electionis consensus in arbitrio nostræ voluntatis."— Benzo, apud Menckenum, i. 393.

² Cenni Monumenta, ii. 261, contains the ordo for the coronation of Henry and Agnes. Höfler devotes many pages to the ceremony, i. 236–250.

deprived of all its pastors, since the ordination by a simoniacal bishop annulled the orders.¹ Whoever was knowingly ordained by a simoniacal bishop, was bound not to exercise his functions till after forty days' penance. But Clement sate alone in his unworldly holiness; the Council, assembled to reform the Church, was interrupted, if not broken up, by a fierce dispute for precedence between the Archbishops of Ravenna, of Milan, and of Aquileia. The decision in favor of the German Archbishop of Ravenna, unpopular doubtless with the Italians, was confirmed by threats of excommunication against the other contumacious prelates, if they should renew the strife.² Rome herself might seem impatient of foreign rulers. The fatal climate asserted her injured supremacy. Clement II. died before the close of the year.³

A.D. 1047.
Oct. 9.

A bold attempt was made to reassert the claims of Benedict IX. Benedict IX. He appeared in Rome under the protection of the Marquis of Tuscany, and held the pontificate for nine months. But he fled

¹ So universal was this crime, that the Abbot Guido, when Boniface of Tuscany, the father of Matilda, one of the most pious churchmen of the day, went to make his annual confession at the monastery of Pomposa thought it right to scourge this vice out of the penitent: —

“ Sic de re Guido sacer abbas arguit, immo
Hunc Bonifacium, ne venderet amplius, ipsum
Ante Dei Matris altare flagellat amaris
Verberibus nudum, qui deliciis fuit usus,
Pomposæ vovit tunc abbatique Guidoni,
Ecclesiam nullam quod per se venderet unquam.”

Donizo, l. 14.

² Labb. Concil. sub ann.

³ I quote once for all the famous lines of Peter Damiani, applicable on so many German invasions of Rome: —

“ Roma vorax hominum, domat ardua colla virorum,
Roma ferax febrium, necis est uberrima frugum,
Romanæ febres stabili sunt jure fideles ”

again on the first appearance of the new Pope environed by German soldiers; he had been abandoned by the Tuscan marquis.¹ For the obsequious clergy and people had in the mean time sent to Germany ^{July 16,} to submit themselves to the nomination of the ^{1048.} Emperor.² Halinard, Archbishop of Lyons, declined the perilous advancement; the choice fell on Poppo, Bishop of Brixen. He had hardly time to ^{Damasus II.} reach Rome, and to take the name of Dam- ^{Aug. 9, 1048.} asus II., when he too fell a victim to the summer fever. This pontificate lasted but twenty-three days.³

This rapid succession could not but give rise to reports of foul means, employed by the unscrupulous Italians to get rid of these strangers, no less dreaded for their austerity, than hated for their usurpation of the Roman rights. But Italy was overawed by the commanding character and unshaken authority of the Emperor Henry III. No secular power dared to offer resistance, there was no Cisalpine prelate, whose lofty piety and courageous sacerdotal dignity could venture, or warrant opposition. Rome and Italy again looked submissively to the Transalpine monarch for a successor to these two short-lived Pontiffs.

Yet this absolute nomination to the papacy by the

¹ Vit. apud Murat. Annal. Roman. p. 469.

² It is said that Benedict IX., persuaded by the Abbot of Grotta Ferrata, retired into that monastery, repented of his sins, and died an exemplary monk. But S. Peter Damiani, on the authority of the Bishop of Capri, raises his ghost, to compel his successor to devote some of his ill-gotten wealth to the poor. — Opuscul. xiv. 3. -

³ Boniface, Marquis of Tuscany, received orders from the Emperor to conduct this bishop "full of pride" to Rome, where in twenty days he died, body and soul. — Bonizo, p. 803. Was this merely the Italian hatred to a German pope, or some personal hostility of Bonizo? Either way it is characteristic.

uncontrolled authority of the Emperor could not but alarm the jealous hierarchical spirit throughout Europe, as well as in Italy. The flagrant venality and vices of the Roman clergy might justify, for once or for a time, the intervention of the supreme secular power. The declared aversion of Henry to the dominant evil of simony, the lofty language which he used concerning the reformation of the Church, his own profoundly religious life, might tempt the most zealous churchmen to acquiesce in a despotism commended by such results, and exercised so much for the honor and for the welfare of Christendom. But the clergy, ever as intuitively and sagaciously jealous to detect the secret encroachment of any principle dangerous to their power, as skilful in establishing any one favorable to their interest, were not off their guard. There was one, whose searching eyesight was watching, who was warning, and taking measures to awaken that dread of secular interference, which came even countenanced by such manifest and uncontested advantages. Hildebrand, in his exile in Germany, was steadily surveying the course of affairs.

The imperial choice fell upon a prelate, in whom, *Leo IX.* though of noble descent, and nearly allied to the Emperor,¹ the churchman predominated over the subject of the Empire. Though with such claims to the highest advancement, supported as it now too rarely was, with the fame of transcendent piety avouched by vision, wonder, and spiritual communion with the other world, Bruno had contented himself with the poor and humble bishopric of Toul.² There he was distinguished

¹ The Emperor Conrad's mother and the father of Bruno were cousins german. Conrad spoke of his "*consanguineum et . . . affectum avitæ propinquitatis.*" — Wibert, *Vit. Leon. IX.* i. 18.

² The early life of Bruno is related by his affectionate and admiring fol-

by his unimpeachable holiness, his gentleness to those below him (he constantly washed the feet of the poor), but no less by his inflexible assertion of all the rights and possessions of his see and the privileges of his order. According to his affectionate biographer, his person was beautiful, his charity boundless, and he had a rare power of affecting his hearers as a preacher, even hardly less as officiating in the services of the church. He was accomplished in all the science of the time, especially in music. Nor did he altogether decline, or betray any want of capacity for secular affairs; he had interposed as ambassador in the disputes between the Empire and the kingdom of France; his negotiations had maintained the peace between Conrad and King Robert.

The Bishop of Toul might tremble at the awful responsibilities of the papacy.¹ As a pilgrim he had visited year after year the tombs of the Apostles; he knew Rome, he knew how uncongenial was her air to the German constitution, her manners to the austere virtue of a severe German prelate. Some natural dread, some misgivings as to the possibility of a complete reform may have mingled with the Christian humility which shrunk from the glorious burden. Even after his reluctant consent, he absolutely refused to owe his election to the mere will of the Emperor; he would at the least have the outward show of free consent from the clergy and people of Rome. This strong hierarchical feeling was confirmed, it is said, by the refusal of Hildebrand, whose austere virtue and lofty churchmanship had be-

lower, Archdeacon Wibert, with its full portion of legendary marvel. — Apud Muratori, *Script. Ital.* iii.

¹ There is a recent, prolix, and somewhat feeble biography of Leo IX., by a zealous Roman Catholic, Hünkler (Maintz, 1851). It contains, I think, nothing new.

gun to command notice, to accompany to Rome a Pope, chosen by the uncanonical appointment of a layman. In the strong language of Hildebrand, it was to appear as an apostate, not as an apostle.¹ Had it been suggested by no loftier motive, nothing could have been more politic than this flattery to the pride of the Roman clergy and people. Whether he did not assume, or threw off by the advice of Hildebrand, the mitre and the purple robe, the Bishop of Toul did not travel to Rome as a pontiff but as a pilgrim. His humble attire and demeanor attracted far more notice than the familiar pomp of a prelate. Multitudes crowded around him; it was rumored that celestial music was heard, and that wonders attended upon his journey. The Teverone suddenly withdrew its overflowing waters to let him pass. He was met, as he drew near, barefooted, to Rome, by the clergy and the people; but even then he would not ascend the papal throne without a solemn appeal to the semblance at least of an election, a recognition of his authority by what appeared to be free suffrages.²

Nothing could contrast more strongly than the whole demeanor of Leo IX., such was the name he assumed, with the Italian popes, who had recently held the holy office. His first object was the restoration of the dilapidated church of St. Peter; and visits to the celebrated places of pilgrimage, Mount Garganus, and the monastery of St. Benedict at Monte Casino. He had unexampled difficulties to struggle with. The wealthy See

¹ Bonizo, apud Cefel. ii. p. 83. Compare a long note of Theiner, *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit*, v. ii. p. 6.

² One account, intended for panegyric, would convict him of downright hypocrisy. He declared that he merely came to Rome as a pilgrim, to visit the tombs of the apostles. — Leonis IX. Vit. a Nic. Arragon.

of Rome was reduced to the lowest state of poverty. The clergy had alienated the benefices to their own children, the barons had seized the estates; Pope John had plundered the churches; no pilgrims dared to approach with costly offerings. The money which Bruno had brought from home was soon exhausted. His German followers showed a disposition to desert their poor master, of whose wealth as Pope they had doubtless entertained magnificent notions: a timely offering by some wealthy votaries from Benevento, who had heard of the Pope's virtues, relieved his immediate necessities. Public confidence was restored, the Pope went on performing all the great and imposing acts of his Office, the consecration of wealthy abbots, the confirmation of privileges to remote monasteries; and, doubtless, the grateful oblations began again to flow into the papal treasury. Of his measures to resume the usurped possessions of the church the records are silent. But the great object of his saintly care and ambition was the reformation of the corrupted church. He devoted himself to wage implacable war with the two dominant evils of his time, as they were esteemed by all zealous churchmen, simony and concubinage. A council met at Rome: again the severer prelates proposed by one sweeping interdict to annul the orders, and to degrade every clerical person who was in any way implicated in simony, who had made any gift, payment, or contract to obtain a bishopric, or other office in the church.¹

¹ On the notoriety of the simoniac proceedings at Rome:—

“*Heu sedes Apostolica
Orbis olim gloria,
Nunc, pro dolor! efficeris
Officina Simonis.*”

Damian, lib. iv. Epist. ix. p. 109.

But again it was found that the times would not endure these summary remedies. It would have deprived almost the whole of the clergy; and as, by annulling their orders, it rendered all their acts invalid, every sacrament, ordination, consecration; it absolutely interrupted, or rendered doubtful the whole spiritual succession of the order.¹ The Pope, either from the gentleness of his disposition, or from the necessity of the times, was obliged to adopt more lenient measures, to accept certain penances from the delinquents, and on confession, humiliation, and absolution, to restore the offender to his function or dignity.

The general concubinage, or rather marriage of the clergy, no less embarrassed the austere reformers.² It was determined that the clergy of Rome should no longer live scattered about in private houses, but in colleges or separate dwellings, and so be submitted to rigid superintendence and discipline. Women convicted of unlawful intercourse with the clergy were to lose their freedom and become slaves attached to the Lateran palace.³ But these were not the worst vices of the clergy.

¹ "Ita ut non solum ab ipsis, sed a plerisque diceretur episcopis, omnes pene basilicas sacerdotalibus officiis destitutas, et præcipue missarum solennia ad subversionem Christianæ religionis, et desperationem omnium circumquaque fidelium funditus omittenda." — Damiani, *Liber Gratissimus*, c. 35.

² "Perrarus inveniretur qui non esset uxoratus vel concubinatus. De simoniâ quid dicam? omnes pene ecclesiasticos ordines hæc mortifera belua devoraverat, ut qui ejus morsum evaserat, rarus inveniretur." — Vit. S. Joann. Gualberti. Non erubescabant sacerdotes uxores ducere, palam nuptias faciebant, nefanda matrimonia contrahebant et legibus eas dotabant, cum quibus secundum leges nec in unâ domo simul habitare debebant. — Bruno Sign. ap. Murator. pp. 346, 347.

³ Et quæcunque damnabiles fæminæ intra Romana mœnia reperirentur Presbyteris prostitutæ, deinceps Lateranensi palatio adjudicarentur ancillæ. This may have been somewhat later in 1051. — Petri Damiani Epist. ad Cunibert. Taurin. Episc.

The stern ascetic Peter Damiani, who now comes forward the absolute unswerving model of monkhood, presented a book to the Pope, the title of which expressed in the coarsest form the unnatural vices widely prevalent among the monks as well as the secular clergy, a book which would shock a more sensitive age, but was received by the Pope as an honest and bold exposition of the morals of the times.¹

Damiani's blind monastic fury perceived not that the argument of his repulsive book was against himself. His remedy, the prohibition of marriage, was not likely to correct this frightful state of things. The Bishops at a synod in Rome acquiesced in the prohibition of marriage, but took no steps to enforce it. Of the worse evil, perhaps wisely, they were silent.² The German Pope might appear to turn his back in horror and disgust from the scenes of such vices. He would seek elsewhere for devout and rigid minds, which might console him by their holy sympathy; and some were yet to be found in every part of Europe, either on the episcopal throne, or in the rigorous cloister.

The saintly ambition therefore of Leo did not confine his views for the reformation of the Church to the city of Rome or to Italy. He aspired to comprehend the whole of Latin Christendom under his personal super

¹ The title of one chapter is enough to show the nature of this odious book, the Gomorrhianus of Peter Damiani — '*De diversitate peccantium contra naturam.*' No detail is spared. Compare Leonis Epist. prefixed to Damiani's book. The wiser Alexander II. stole the book and shut it up. Of this Damiani complains bitterly. — Epist. ii. 6.

² Sub anathemate interdictum est, . . . ut sacerdotes et Levitæ et subdiaconi cum uxoribus non coeant: quæ res magnum veternosum serpentem concitavit in iram. Quod audientes episcopi primo quidem veritati non valentes resistere tacuere; postea vero, suadente humani generis inimico, inobedienter celavere. — Bonizo, p. 803.

intendence. Though now hardly seated firmly in his throne at Rome, he resolved to undertake, as it were, a religious visitation of Western Europe, to show himself in each of three great kingdoms as the Supreme Pontiff, as the equal or superior of all secular princes ; and that in all the genuine characteristics of power, the protection of the oppressed, the redress of grievances, the correction of abuses, the punishment even of the haughtiest and most powerful offenders against the statutes of the church, the suppression of simony, the restoration of monastic discipline. Some of Leo's predecessors had indeed crossed the Alps, either to obtain by personal supplication the assistance of the Transalpine sovereigns against their enemies ; or to take part in the secular or ecclesiastical affairs of those kingdoms. Latterly the Popes had dwelt in their remote seclusion at Rome, and that seclusion alone had permitted the reverential imagination of the world still to invest them in some lingering sanctity. Yet rumors and the reports of the pilgrims could not but disseminate through Europe, even to its remotest parts, the degraded character of the Italian Popes ; the rapacity, the licentiousness, the venality had become more and more notorious. How some Popes had lived, how they had died, could not be altogether disguised. This had been proclaimed in full synods of Transalpine prelates, as at Rheims. The difficulty of reconciling the loftiest spiritual offices, the holiest functions, with the most unholy life, could not but force itself upon the religious mind of Christendom.

Leo came forth to Europe, not only with the power and dignity, but with the austere holiness, the indefatigable religious activity, the majestic virtue which

became the head of Christendom. His personal character and habits would bear the closest and most jealous inspection: he was not merely blameless in morals, but exemplary in the depth and intensity of his devotion. Wherever he went he visited the most severe of the clergy or of the monastic orders, men already sainted by the popular devotion; like

Leo's visitation beyond the Alps.

St. Gualberto of Vallombrosa,¹ and the successor of the holy Odilo at Clugny. All recognized a kindred spirit, and hailed the genuine Pontiff. He passed by Florence; he held a council at Pavia; he crossed the Alps to Germany. Throughout Germany his time was occupied, till he reached Cologne, in consecrating

A.D. 1049.
March 14.

churches, and bestowing privileges on monasteries. On his arrival at Cologne he was received by the Archbishop Herman, the Chancellor of the Empire, with the greatest state. Herman was a

June 29.

prelate of a kindred spirit, pious, and disposed to hierarchical magnificence; both himself and the Pope knowing, no doubt, the influence of the splendid ecclesiastical ceremonial on the popular mind. The Pope created a new and high office for the Archbishop of Cologne, the arch-chancellorship of the Apostolic See. The archbishop became a kind of northern Pope; seven cardinal priests were appointed daily to read mass, sandalled, at the altar of St. Peter in the cathedral. At Cologne appeared the pious Emperor, Henry III., in military array; he was engaged in war with Godfrey, Duke of Upper Lorraine, and a powerful confederacy, comprehending Baldwin of Flanders, and Herman of Mons, and Theodoric of Holland, secretly supported by Henry I., King of France. Godfrey had been already

¹ See the Lives of S. Gualberto.

under the ban of the Empire for expelling his brother from his inheritance, the dukedom of Lower Lorraine. He had been defeated and pardoned. But when, on the death of his brother, the Emperor granted away the dukedom of Lower Lorraine to Frederic of Luxemburg, he again rushed to arms. With his lawless allies, he had destroyed the imperial palace at Nimeguen, and burned Verdun. But their predatory bands had suffered a defeat by the forces of the Bishops of Liege, Metz, and Utrecht.

Leo scrupled not to smite with his spiritual arms the enemy, the rebel against the Empire, who was accused of burning churches in his marauding warfare. He excommunicated Godfrey of Lorraine; and that turbulent prince, who had defied the authority and the power of the Emperor, bowed in awe beneath the spiritual censure. He came to Aix-la-Chapelle, where the Pope July 27. advanced to receive him; he came as a humble suppliant. The Pope with difficulty extorted his pardon, but not the restitution of his dukedom, from the resentful Emperor. But Godfrey was broken in spirit by the appalling presence of the Pope; he went to Verdun, and submitted to the most humiliating penance: he was publicly scourged before the altar, in order to obtain a readmission into the church. He was condemned to rebuild the cathedral which he had burned; and the fierce marauder was seen laboring like a common workman in the repairs of the ruined church.

Nor was the religion of Leo IX. too lofty or spiritual for his age; he was as deeply involved in its superstitions. The ecclesiastical Hercules, who travelled about beating down the hydra heads of clerical avarice and licentiousness, is surrounded, like him of old, with an

atmosphere of mystic legend. Leo was the most sure discoverer of reliques, wherever it was desirable that reliques should be found ; wherever he prayed for them, the bodies of saints came to light. His life was a life of visions ; miracles broke out on all great, sometimes on more insignificant occasions.¹

Germany had received with submission, not unmingled with pride, the holy German Pope. The German clergy, on the whole, stood higher than that of any other part of Latin Christendom. The religious character of the reigning Emperor, Henry III., had maintained at least superior decency of manners ; he had discouraged simony, and advanced the more religious of the clergy. But when the austere Pope proposed to pass into France, to visit Rheims, the king and the clergy heard with equal dismay of the unwelcome design. In France, with the exception of some exemplary prelates, the hierarchy were more feudal in their tenures and in their habits : the benefices had fallen into the hands of warlike nobles, more secular than ecclesiastic in their lives ; they were obtained by more questionable means, devoted far less exclusively to religious purposes. The king, no doubt, at the suggestion of his clergy, excused himself from this unwonted visitation, on the plea that his bishops and abbots, with the rest of his feudal array, had been

¹ The most remarkable miracle, of later date, was this. A precious cup, presented to him by the Archbishop of Cologne, fell on the ground and was broken to pieces. At the word of Leo the pieces came together, the cup was again whole, and the fracture was only marked by a thin thread (capillo). But the most extraordinary part was, that all the while not a drop of the liquor was spilled. The authority for this was Hugo, Archbishop of Besançon, an eye-witness, who piously stole the cup from the Pope "devoto furto." Wibert, ii. 6. It is related in a Papal diploma, and was avouched by Gregory VII.

summoned to attend his banner against the hostile Normans.

The courteous pertinacity of the Pope would not admit the excuse. As bishop of Toul he had pledged himself to be present at the consecration of the new and splendid church at Rheims, and the removal of the remains of the holy St. Remi; as Pope he was bound to fulfil his pious engagement. St. Remi was the popular saint of France, equal to St. Martin of Tours, superior to that host of saints which had been canonized by the early zeal of the Franks during the reigns of the Merovingians. St. Remi had baptized Clovis, and so had expelled Arianism from the kingdom of France. Nothing could deepen so much the reverence for the Pope throughout that part of France as his devout respect for St. Remi. The abbot Heriward had been summoned on his allegiance to attend the royal array: the king was obliged to dismiss him, when advanced some days' march, to attend on his sacred functions.

The Pope came to Rheims: nothing could surpass the pomp of the ceremonial for the consecration of the church. It was the day of St. Remi, the day Oct. 2. on which, in ordinary years, pilgrims crowded from all quarters of the world to the shrine of the tutelary saint of France. It was a time singularly well chosen for the papal visit. Such vast multitudes thronged from all sides (at the council there were representatives of England, no doubt many English among the zealous votaries) that the Pope was obliged to address them from the roof of a house. The church was with the utmost difficulty cleared for the performance of the ceremony; the pious spectators trampled each other under foot. The Pope himself supported for a time

the chest or coffin which contained the inestimable bones of St. Remi, during the long procession which awed, delighted, prostrated in reverence and elevated in pride as the possessors of such wonder-working reliques, the countless worshippers.

The consecration of the church was the preliminary to a council summoned to meet at Rheims, Oct. 3.

The council was not imposing for its numbers; it reckoned but twenty bishops, including the strangers, and about fifty abbots; the rest were engaged in following the royal wars. A strife for precedence arose between the Metropolitans of Treves and of Rheims. Treves had but recently received the title of Primate from Leo himself; Rheims asserted his immemorial primacy over the Church of Gaul. The Council of Rheims.

prudent Leo refused to decide the question. The four Archbishops of Treves, Rheims, Lyons, and Besançon sat in a circle around the Pope.¹ The Cardinal-Deacon opened the conclave, declaring the subjects which demanded the grave consideration of the assembled fathers: simony, the unlawful possession of clerical benefices by the laity, marriages within the prohibited degrees, desecration of churches, irregular divorces and second marriages, the abandonment of their vows by monks, the military services of the clergy, the plunder and imprisonment of the poor, unnatural crimes, and certain heresies which had arisen in France. Every prelate present was summoned, under pain of the papal anathema, if he was conscious of any guilt of simony, openly to confess his sin. The Archbishop of Treves arose and made his protestation in the most solemn

¹ There were present three English dignitaries: Dudic, Bishop of Bath, the Abbot of St. Augustine in Canterbury, and the Abbot Alvisius.

terms. He was followed by Halinard, the venerable Archbishop of Lyons, who had declined the papacy; and by the Archbishop of Besançon. All eyes were turned on Guido of Rheims, who sat in suspicious silence. Guido arose, and demanded a delay until the next morning, that he might have some private communication with the Pope. His request was granted. The turn of the Bishops came. All declared their innocence except Pudicus of Nantes, Hugo of Langres, Godfrey of Coutances, Hugo of Nevers. The examination of their offences was adjourned to the next sitting. The Abbots were not so scrupulous or not so exempt from guilt. Heriward of Rheims declared his own innocence. Even Hugh of Clugny, though he called God to witness that he had no concern in any simoniacal contract, acknowledged that there were suspicious rumors abroad concerning him. Of the rest, some who could not excuse themselves, endeavored to palliate or conceal their crimes. One, Arnold of Poitiers, accused of grave offences, was deposed. The Cardinal-Deacon then, under the menace of the same apostolic anathema, demanded whether there was present any man who held any one besides the Pope to be the head of the Catholic Church. There was a profound silence: the traditionary passages of the canons were then read, on which was grounded the right of the Pontiff of Rome to the primacy of the Church.¹ It was then proclaimed that the Pope forbade any one, under pain of anathema, to leave Rheims, without his permission, before the close of the council.

The following morning Guido of Rheims, before the

¹ Was this, as it were, to exorcise Rheims from the evil doctrines proclaimed at the former council under the influence of Gerbert?

opening of the synod, had his private conference with the Pope. Notwithstanding this he was summoned again by the Cardinal-Deacon to answer on the question of simony, and other grave offences, of which he was publicly accused. Guido answered not; he demanded a consultation with his friends, he retired with the Archbishop of Besançon, the bishops of Angers, Soissons, Nevers, Senlis, Morin (Boulogne). On his return he demanded that the Bishop of Senlis should be heard in his name. The Bishop of Senlis came forward and declared that the Archbishop of Rheims was not guilty of simony. The Pope demanded that he should take the oath: so had his holy predecessor Gregory the Great required of Maximus of Salona. Guido struggled in the toils, again he requested delay: the Pope, content with his humiliation, granted it on condition that in the next spring he should appear to answer before a council at Rome. The other charges were allowed to fall from want of proof. But the bishops escaped not so easily. Hugo of Langres was arraigned not only for simony, but for murder, whoredom, and unnatural crimes. Witnesses were at hand to prove these monstrous wickednesses. The bishop confessed the simony, but repelled the other accusations: the examination of these charges therefore was postponed till the next sitting of the council. Before that sitting Hugo of Langres had fled; he was solemnly cited; he was sought for in his lodgings in due legal form by the Bishops of Senlis and Angers; he was deposed and anathematized as guilty of contumacy. Hugo of Nevers acknowledged that his father had given a large sum of money to purchase his bishopric. Since that time he could condemn himself for no of-

fence, yet he dreaded God's wrath, and was prepared to lay down, he did actually lay down, his pastoral staff at the feet of the Pope. The Pope was content with his oath, that at the time he knew nothing of the simony, and restored his staff. Godfrey of Coutances confessed that his brother had, without his knowledge, bought him his bishopric. As soon as he knew the fact, he had endeavored to fly; but the people had brought him back by force. The council on his oath pronounced him innocent. Bishop Pudicus of Nantes confessed that his father, who had been Bishop of Nantes before him, had secured him the succession by bribery; he admitted that by the same ungodly means he had obtained the ordination after his father's death. He was deposed, but in mercy allowed to retain the order of a priest. The council proceeded to condemn the bishops who had dared to disobey the papal summons to the council. The anathema fell on the Archbishop of Sens, the Bishops of Amiens and Beauvais; the Bishop of Laon, the adviser of the King of France to impede the council, and the Abbot of St. Medard, who had left the council without the permission of the Pope. Their sees were declared void (the Archbishop had been forced upon his diocese by the King; the Bishop of Amiens was a great hunter); the clergy and people proceeded to new elections. Among the other statutes of this council, chiefly the reënactment of former canons, one condemned a Spanish prelate, the Archbishop of St. James of Compostella, who had dared to assume the title of an Apostolic bishop; and aspired, as Gerbert of Rheims to be a Gallican pope, to be the Pope of Spain.

The Norman historian sums up the acts of the Council of Rheims. Priests were forbidden to bear arms, or

to have wives. The bearing arms they gave up without reluctance; but even now they will not their harlots (such is the name with which their wives were branded), nor submit to chastity.¹

To the Gallican council at Rheims succeeded a German council, attended by forty prelates at Mentz, among these three great Metropolitans, Bardo of Mentz, Eberhard of Treves, Herman of Cologne, with Engelhard of Magdeburg, Adalbert of Hamburg and Bremen.² The Council of Mentz confirmed the acts of the Council of Rheims. The same strong resolutions Oct. 19. passed against simony and concubinage. Sibico, Bishop of Spire, was forced to take the sacrament in proof of his guiltlessness of simony. According to the biographer of Leo, Sibico's cheek was struck with palsy, and he bore for life the brand of his perjury.³ A contest for the archbishopric of Besançon was decided in favor of the Metropolitan Hugo, who had rendered such true allegiance to the Pope at Rheims. During his return to Italy, Leo either visited in person, or confirmed by statute, the privileges of many famous monasteries — Fulda, Lorsch, Moyen-Moutier, Altorf, Hirschau, Reichenau, Donauwerth.⁴ He passed Christmas in Verona.

¹ "Tunc ibidem generale concilium tenuit, et inter reliqua ecclesiæ commoda, quæ instituit, presbyteris arma ferre et conjuges habere prohibuit. Unde consuetudo lethalis paulatim exinaniri cepit — arma quidem ferre presbyteri jam gratanter desiere, sed a pellicibus adhuc nolunt abstinere, nec pudicitie inservire." — Orderic. Vital. Compare Vit. Hildeberti, in Act. SS. April 29: Alberic Destroismontaines, Leibnitz, p. 89

² Adam. Bremens. Hist. Eccl. ap. Lindenbrog. Mansi et Hartzheim, sub ann.

³ Wibert, Vit. Leon. ii. 5. The charge against Sibico, according to Adam of Bremen, was adultery.

⁴ Among the countless treasures of reliques bestowed on the church of Altorf, were pieces of the cradle, the tomb, and the garments of the Redeemer; of the vine which he had planted with his own hand! — of the

Leo IX. returned to Rome. In this single spiritual campaign, by the calm dignity of his holiness, by his appeal to the strong religious reverence of Christendom, he had restored the papacy to all its former authority over the minds of men. He had justly elevated the pride of Germany in having bestowed such a Pope upon the world, crushed the tendencies at least to rebellion in the churches of France and Spain, and brought them again into acknowledged subordination to the See of Rome. He carried back to Italy the respect and the obedience of the world to overawe any still unextirpated desire for the recovery of Italian spiritual domination ; to Rome the assurance of the most powerful Transalpine protection, to suppress the turbulent and mutinous spirit of her nobles and her people.

cross, — of the robe of the Virgin, and the beard of John the Baptist. All this and much more related as if with grave unsuspectingness (is it indeed grave unsuspectingness?) by Hoefer, ii. p. 64. See also the discovery of the site of Hirschau.

CHAPTER II

BERENGAR OF TOURS.

THE unity of Latin Christendom had been threatened during the dark age of the Papacy not only by the separation of the spiritual monarchy into independent dynasties, by the elevation of a Gallican and of a Spanish primate; the allegiance even of Ravenna and Milan to the supreme pontiff was doubtful and contested. Nothing could have preserved the papal supremacy if it had continued to descend in its line of lawless Roman princes. It might have been endangered even by a succession of German pontiffs of less energetic, commanding, and holy character than Leo IX. — pontiffs in whom the German nationality had predominated over their churchmanship — for Christendom would hardly have submitted long to the Pope, only an obsequious vassal of the German Emperor. More, however, than this, the unity of doctrine, that great system of imaginative Christianity which had so long ruled the mind of Latin Christendom, was menaced with a controversy which struck at the roots of its power, prematurely undermined in the hearts of men the greatest of those influences by which the hierarchy swayed the world, and might have led, long before Christendom was ripe for a more spiritual and intellectual religion, to a fatal disturbance of the traditional and dominant faith. The con-

troversy raised by Berengar on the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, his protest against the new rigid form of Transubstantiation into which that doctrine had but recently been cast by Paschasius Radbert and his followers, was totally different from those which to this period had broken the unity of the Church. Sects from time to time had arisen and were still rising¹ in different parts of Latin Christendom whose opinions departed widely from the dominant faith. But the principle of these sects was, in general, separation from the Church; they were societies working in secret, withdrawing their members from the communion of the Church and from subordination to the hierarchy; bound together either by peculiar tenets or by some intuitive harmony of feeling and opinion; here organized under their own priesthood, there held together by aversion to the pride and to the vices of the established clergy; esteeming apostolic poverty and apostolic humility the only signs of apostolic truth and authority. Infinitely various, but with some leading kindred principles, these sects had one common character, they were sects. They either asserted each itself to be the sole true church, or, altogether rejecting the notion of a visible church, rested on the evangelic truth of their doctrines, on their conformity with the sacred Scriptures (never altogether abandoned as a distinct tenet); or they had inherited the yet unextinguished principles of Arian or Manichean opinions, the latter of which seem to have been constantly flowing by untraceable channels into the west. These sects were the authors, in different quarters of Europe, of wide-spread and still renewed revolt; but this revolt was still beaten down in detail by the

¹ This affiliation of these very obscure sects will be hereafter traced.

strong arm of ecclesiastical and temporal power: they were confuted by the irrefragable argument of fire and sword.

But the opinions of Berengar threatened a civil war — a contest within the Church, within the clergy itself. He declared that his was the true Catholic doctrine; from his school at Tours he proclaimed a haughty intellectual defiance to all the other theologic schools of Christendom. He was himself probably unconscious of the ultimate bearing of his own views. He appealed to the clergy generally, in all likelihood as unconscious; but who had an intuitive apprehension, equally alarming to the prudence of the cautious and to the sensitive jealousy of the devout, that they were descending from a higher to a lower ground — that the Sacrament, by this new or revived interpretation, was sinking in its majesty and in its efficacy. This Sacrament — the Eucharist — from the earliest times had withdrawn into the most profound mystery; it had been guarded with the most solemn reverence, shrouded in the most impressive ceremonial. It had become as it were the Holy of Holies of the religion, in which the presence of the Godhead was only the more solemn from the surrounding darkness. That Presence had as yet been unapproached by profane and searching controversy, had been undefined by canon, neither agitated before Council, nor determined by Pope. During all these centuries no language had been thought too strong to express the overpowering awe and reverence of the worshippers. The oratory of the pulpit and the hortatory treatise had indulged freely in the boldest images; the innate poetry of the faith had worked those images into realities. Christ's real Presence was in some indescrib-

able manner in the Eucharist ; but under the notion of the real Presence might meet conceptions the most dissimilar, ranging from the most subtle spiritualism to the most gross materialism ; that of those whose faith would be as profoundly moved by the commemorative symbols, which brought back upon the memory in the most vivid reality the one sacrifice upon the cross ; as that of the vulgar, to whom the more material the more impressive the notion, to whom the sacred elements would be what the fetiche is to the savage.

Between these two extremes would be the great multitude of believers, who would contemplate the whole subject with remote and reverential awe. To these the attempt at the scrutiny or even the comprehension of the mystery would appear the height of profane presumption ; yet their intuitive perception would shrink on the one hand from refining the holy bread and wine into mere symbols, on the other from that transubstantiation which could not but expose the actual Godhead to all the accidents to which those elements, not now merely corporeal, and with all the qualities of the human flesh and blood, but actually deified, might be subject. It was the fatal term Transubstantiation, first used (as is commonly, but it seems erroneously said) by Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corvey, which startled some of the more reflective minds ; according to this term the elements ceased entirely to be what they still seemed to be to the outward senses. The substance of the bread and wine was actually annihilated — nothing existed but the body and blood of the Redeemer, the body and blood of the Redeemer resuscitated in the flesh, yet to which belonged the ubiquity, the eternity

of the divine nature.¹ Such a phrase could not but cause some reaction. But the leader of that reaction, Berengar, had surrendered himself as the humble pupil of the one great thinker, the one purely metaphysical intelligence, who during this period had been so much in advance of his age as almost to elude their theological jealousy.

It was impossible but that among the minds withdrawn into profound contemplation by monasticism, altogether secluded from practical intercourse with the world, there should be some in whom the severe intelligence should entirely predominate. Such men — the religious awe being less strong and less exclusively exercised than the logical faculty — would not be restrained from the cool analytic examination even of the most accredited theologic phraseology; they would subtly scrutinize the inward sense of words, reduce them from their rhetorical or poetic form to their present meaning; they would be, by mental constitution, the intellectual parents of the Nominalists in the twelfth century.

Of these the most remarkable was the Scotch or Irish monk, John Scotus or Erigena. Erigena was a philosopher of a singularly subtle mind: men wondered at this subtlety, which was so high above the general train

¹ Paschasius Radbert's Treatise is in Martene et Durand, t. ix. Paschasius, though perhaps his *theory* of Transubstantiation (he does not use the word) may be explained away into what is called Impanation (as by Ebrard, *Dogma vom Heiligen Abendmahl*, i. 406), certainly followed it out into its grossest consequences, the miracles of the Host bleeding, assuming a human form, that of a child, etc., c. xiv. Sirmond claims for him (in *Vitâ*) the merit of having first matured the full doctrine of the middle ages; others ascribe it to Lanfranc. The Schoolmen stripped off all the awfulness, and coldly discussed it in all its naked materialism. Compare Gieseler on Paschasius and on Berengar.

of popular notions as to command universal reverence rather than suspicion. But he had not only broken the bonds of Latin Christianity, he went almost beyond the bounds of Christianity itself. The philosopher dwelt alone in his transcendental world; he went fathoming on, fearless and unreprieved, in the very abysses of human thought; and, it is not improbable, had followed out his doctrines into that theory at which men in whom the rationalistic faculty prevails, and who are still under the influence of a latent religiousness, so often arrive. He had wrought out a vague Pantheism, singularly anticipative of that which in its various forms now rules in modern Germany. But we must at a later period revert to Erigena as in one sense the parent of scholasticism, but of scholasticism as a free, discursive, speculative science, before it had been bound up with rigid orthodoxy by Aquinas, Bonaventura, and Duns Scotus. Berengar, it should seem, with a weaker and far less original mind, had been caught in the logical trammels of Erigena, from which he could not escape. He was not without the pride which arises from the adoption as well as the discovery of new and apparently distinct views of mysterious subjects, as manifesting superior intellectual strength and acuteness (that pride is betrayed in his somewhat contemptuous challenge to Lanfranc), or he shrank from the coarser materialism which seemed enforced by the doctrines of Paschasius Radbert, and which had already encountered opposition from Rabanus Maurus, the monk Ratramn, and some others.¹ He proclaimed, as the true doctrine

¹ On the question of the authorship of the treatise ascribed to Scotus Erigena, and to the monk Ratramnus, compare Gieseler. The treatise of Scotus, if he wrote expressly on the subject, is lost. Compare Schröckh, *xxiii.* 441, *et seqq.*

of the Church, the counter definition of his master Erigena, which, asserting the real Presence, declared that real Presence spiritually conceived.¹

On the other hand, in the vast European hierarchy, there could not be wanting minds of equally Lanfranc. powerful logical subtlety, and trained in dialectic science, who would repress within themselves the rebellious intelligence; and in the confidence arising out of their infelt accordance with the dominant creed, with the sagacity, not merely timorous, but conscientiously jealous, which would tremble at any approach to the unsettling of great religious questions, or the diminishing of the sacerdotal power² (the only bulwark against brute force and blind ferocity), would espouse the established creed with the zeal and ardor of conscientious churchmanship. Such was Lanfranc, a native of Pavia, under whose learned government the Norman monastery of Bee was rising into fame; and Lanfranc himself was gaining that high character which designated him hereafter for the Norman primate of England. Some jealousy may have lurked in the mind of the master of the great school of Tours, which had so long enjoyed high reputation as a seat of theologic learning, against the upstart university, if it may be so called,³

¹ The discovery of the famous treatise of Berengar by Lessing, its recent publication at Berlin, furnishes us with Berengar's own distinct, deliberate statement of his views. It is a hard, harsh, obscure treatise, apparently little likely to awaken enthusiasm, or to attach devoted followers.

² Miracles were not wanting to refute Berengar. A priest saw and touched the form of a child on the altar. He kissed it; it resumed the appearance of bread. Berengar tauntingly said, "*Speciosa certe pax nebulonis, ut cui oris præberet basium, dentium inferret exitium.*" — Wm. Malmesb., p. 466.

³ See in Malmesbury the very curious account of the virtue, austerity, and sanctity of Berengar, by Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans, p. 466.

among the yet barbarous Normans. In his challenge to Lanfranc, Berengar acknowledges the ability of that teacher with a haughty condescension, reproving him for the haste with which he has presumed to condemn the judgments of Erigena.¹

The opinions of Berengar were widely disseminated by the poor scholars² who wandered about the country from the school at Tours, and who were maintained at the cost of Berengar. By some they were heard with horror: he was accused, as usual, of opinions which he did not hold — of reducing the Holy Sacrament to a shadow, not a truth — of vague concubinage, and the denial of baptism.³ Others seem to have been overawed by the fame of his erudition. His first antagonist did no great honor to the cause of orthodoxy; it was Hugo, Bishop of Langres, the bishop condemned and degraded by the Council of Rheims for notorious criminality of life. Others wrote in a more respectful and expostulatory tone. The writings of Berengar himself have all the contemptuousness of a mind in which the severe and naked logical faculty has complete mastery, and which cannot comprehend that unison of faith and reasoning which commends itself to those in whom the religious sentiment maintains its power.

Lanfranc had his revenge for the insolent superiority May, 1050. assumed by Berengar. He was present at the Council in Rome held by Pope Leo IX. The

¹ "Hac ergo in re, si ita est, pater, indignum fecisti ingenio quod tibi Deus, *non aspernabile*, contulit, præproperam ferendo sententiam. Nondum enim sategisti in scripturâ divinâ, nec multum contulisti cum tuis diligentioribus." — Lanfranco Berengarius, apud Giles. Lanfranci Opera, Epist. 1.

² Jamque scatebat omnis Gallia ejus doctrinâ per egenos scolares, quos ipse quotidianâ stipe sollicitabat, disseminatâ. — Wm. Malmesb., iii.

³ Authorities in Mahillon, *Analect.*, and Schröckh, p. 509.

opinions of Berengar were brought under discussion, but of those opinions there was no acknowledged or authoritative statement which could expose him to condemnation. Lanfranc, suspected (such was his excuse) of correspondence with the heretic, and thus implicated in his doctrines, produced the fatal letter in which Berengar avowed the opinions of Erigena, proclaimed the Holy Sacrament, as it was asserted, and inaccurately asserted, to be but a figure and a similitude.¹ Berengar was condemned at once; he was commanded to appear at the Council summoned to meet at Vercelli. But to Vercelli Berengar came not;² he had ap- Sept. 1059.

pealed to King Henry of France for protection: he was imprisoned by that monarch in order, as he himself states, to extort money from him; nor would he submit to be judged out of his province. He had not merely proselytes, but fanatical followers. The Church of Tours sent one of their body to deprecate the hasty wrath of the Pope; he was accompanied by a renowned clerk of Burgundy, named Stephen.³ Words ran high:

¹ Compare *Vita Lanfranci* apud Giles. *Oper. Lanfranci*, l. 188. There his friends are said to have sent the letter after him, and that Lanfranc, suspected of heresy on account of his correspondence with Berengar, produced the letter.

² It is remarkable with what supercilious contempt Berengar writes of the Council of Vercelli, even of Leo IX. He denies the right of the Pope to summon him to be judged beyond his metropolitan province. He accuses Leo of having lodged with the Bishop of Vercelli, who was living in open adultery with the wife of his uncle, a nobleman of Pavia, and of having refused to take cognizance of the charge publicly made by his uncle against the bishop — p. 40. By an adverse writer he is reported to have spoken with equal scorn of the Pope and of the see of Rome: "*Nempe S. Leonem P. non Pontificem sed pompificem et pulpificem appellavit, S. Romanam Ecclesiam vanitatis concilium et Ecclesiam malignantium, Romanam sedem non apostolicam sed sedem Satanae dictis et scriptis non timuit appellare.*"—Bernald. *de Berengar. damnatione*. Gieseler has quoted the whole passage, p. 285.

³ "*Dissuaserant secundum ecclesiastica jura, secundum quæ nullus extra provinciam ad judicium ne cogendus est ire.*"

to Lanfranc's learned arguments it was replied, that he who rejected the conclusions of Erigena rejected the words of St. Augustine.¹ One of Lanfranc's party, who branded Berengar with the name of heretic, the Canon of Tours declared, in the name of Almighty God, to be "a liar." But notwithstanding this bold resistance, the Council of Vercelli passed its censure both upon Erigena the master, and the disciple Berengar.

But Berengar treated the excommunication of the Pope and of the Council with sovereign contempt. His disdainful language towards the Pope offended even his friends. He charges his antagonists with ignorant or wilful misrepresentation.² In France his opinions divided the public mind; one distinguished prelate, Bruno of Angers, openly espoused his doctrines; they were favorably received by Froilant of Senlis. The king vacillated between the condemnation of Berengar and tacit connivance at his opinions. Two Councils were held, one by the Duke of Normandy, whom Berengar had endeavored to win over, at his castle of Brion: of this synod the date and the proceedings are but vaguely known. Berengar is said to have withdrawn discomfited, and admitting the truth of the established doctrine. The second was summoned by the king at Paris. There the Bishop of Orleans, the adversary of Berengar, took the lead. The tenets of Berengar and the book of Scotus were denounced by wild acclamation; and it was declared, that, if Berengar did not re-

¹ Much of the treatise "De Sacra Cœnâ," is devoted to the proof that his own doctrines and those of Erigena were the same as those of Ambrose and Augustine.

² Berengar bitterly complains of the misrepresentation of his doctrines: 'Humbertus enim ille tuus, inaudito me . . . scripsit quod voluit, et quod meum non erat, mendaciter meum esse confinxit.'

cant, the clergy would summon the array of the kingdom, march at its head, besiege Berengar in whatever fortress or city he might take refuge, compel him to recant, or to surrender himself as prisoner. But the name of Erigena stood high in France; he had always been held as the most honored divine at the court of Charles the Bald. The king hesitated, and took no further measures for the restraint of Berengar.¹ It was not till towards the close of Leo's life and pontificate that the alarm grew so great at Rome that no less than Hildebrand himself, the cardinal sub-deacon of the Church, now rising towards that height of fame, afterwards to exalt him above all the world, was sent as legate into France to compose that dangerous feud. Hildebrand, with his natural intrepidity, summoned a Council at Tours, to assail his adversary in April, 1054. his stronghold. But at Tours Hildebrand, instead of taking the high ground of authority, condescended to become persuasive and conciliatory; he was content with an ambiguous declaration extorted from Berengar, that after consecration the bread and wine were really the body and blood of the Lord.² With this, and with a faint expression of his determination to carry Beren-

¹ "Ego interim dico: panem et vinum per consecrationem converti in altari, in verum Christi corpus et sanguinem, non mea, non tua, sed evangelica apostolicaque simul autenticarum scripturarum quibus contra ire nefas, est sententia." He subjoins lower: "Quam diceres conversionem . . . minime assignasti." — p. 57. See against Material Transmutation, p. 173. In more than one place Berengar states that he had disguised his opinions for fear of death. — p. 73. See also the distinct view of Berengar's opinions, p. 274. Compare *De Sacra Cœnâ*, pp. 52, 53.

² He states that before Hildebrand: "quod jurarem, panem atque vinum altaris post consecrationem sunt corpus Christi et sanguis. Hæc me sicut re proferrem, juramento confirmavi, corde tenui." It was the *material* change which he rigorously and constantly opposed, by every argument of obscure, indeed, and tortuous logic, but still with unaccommodating rigor.

gar with him to Rome, Hildebrand closed his part in this momentous controversy. The secret is clear: Hildebrand was wanted at Rome; his place was there.¹ The King of France was bringing forward in his council questions of great political importance, an accusation against the King of Spain, and a demand of aid against that King from the Emperor. The Council might be interminably protracted, and Pope Leo was in the utmost peril; his army had been defeated, he was a prisoner; if released, released only to die.² Besides the fatal effects of his humiliation, his macerations had begun to threaten his life; to those so deep in the politics of Rome the progress, the fatal end of his disease might be known by sure prognostics.

But we must reascend two years to Leo, still in the full activity of his youth, still endeavoring to command the whole Latin world by his presence. His aspiration was still to be Pope of Christendom, not of Rome only (though, as will hereafter appear, he had great schemes for the aggrandizement of the Pope in Italy): so during this period he visited rather than took up his residence, or fixed his court, in Rome. Three times, during his pontificate of five years, he crossed the Alps; once already he had been seen in Germany and at Rheims; the second Transalpine visitation took place immediately after the council of Vercelli. Its ostensible object was a great religious ceremony in honor of the

¹ Hildebrand had ordered all the books bearing on the subject to be collected: "*Ut ex eorum auctoritate satisfaceret de eucharistiâ pro cuius diligentiori consideratione et veritatis, Dei misericordiâ, comprehensione hæreticis me insinulaverant homines nihil scientes, et superiores se in scientiâ alios non æquo animo tolerantes.*" — p. 52.

² According to Berengar, p. 53, he had heard of the actual death of Leo: "*Nunciatum illi est, Papam Leonem rebus decessisse humanis.*"

city of which he was still the bishop. The German Popes had introduced a singular kind of plurality, as if the Teuton felt insecure in his Roman see, and still reserved a safe retreat in his native land. Clement II. had retained the bishopric of Bamberg; Leo Oct. 21, 1050. had been several years Pope before he vacated that of Toul.

No gift could be bestowed on a city or on a church of equal value with that of a popular saint; the city grew in honor and in wealth. Not merely were its own citizens more under the influence of the clergy from this increased devotion, but it became a place of pilgrimage; multitudes flocked annually to the shrine with their offerings, and not seldom a profitable commercial mart grew up to the advantage of the town. Gerard had been bishop of Toul; he had reposed for fifty-six years in his tomb. During a ceremonial, as solemn as that which had installed the holy St. Remi in his new shrine, the tomb of Gerard was opened. The body was found in perfect preservation. An altar was consecrated to the new saint; wonderful cures were not wanting; privileges were lavishly bestowed on the favored church, and on the clergy of the favored see.

The Pope again visited some of the great cities of Germany, everywhere making munificent grants, confirming the rights and possessions of monasteries. He was at Treves and at Augsburg; at the Feast Feb. 2, 1051. of the Purification of the Virgin met the Emperor and the Pope. But enemies of the Pope had now arisen at the court of the Emperor. Leo IX. was too much of a German Pontiff for the Italians, not German enough for his countrymen. The Germans, during the reign of the Franconian emperors, had possessed themselves

of some of the wealthiest sees in Italy, as well as of that of Rome.¹ A German held the see of Ravenna; and under his episcopate Ravenna had begun to renew her ancient pretensions to independence of Rome. Leo, in the true Roman spirit, would not endure the encroachments even of a German prelate, raised to his see by the special favor of the Emperor. The Italian prelates at Vercelli joined eagerly in the humiliation of the German at Ravenna; Humfred was degraded and excommunicated by the Pope and Council. At this act the brooding jealousy against the Pope broke out at the court of Henry into open hostility. Bishop Nitger of Freisingen, a magnificent prelate, whose revenue, if in part dedicated to less sacred uses, was splendidly employed on ecclesiastical buildings, during some warm dispute relating to the affair of Ravenna, grasping his neck, said, "May a sword cleave this throat if I work not the ruin of this Pope." The biographer of Leo adds that the bishop² was seized with a pain in the neck, and died in a few days. At Augsburg the Pope was compelled to submit to the restoration of his haughty antagonist. Humfred, it is true, was ordered to make restitution of all he had unlawfully usurped from the Pope, to acknowledge his supremacy and to request his forgiveness. He knelt; "According to the depth of his repentance," said the Pope, "may God forgive him his sins." The prelate rose, and broke out in scornful laughter. Tears filled the eyes of the Pope. "Miser-

¹ Hoefler has drawn out a list of German prelates, by which it appears that the Patriarchate of Aquileia, the Bishoprics of Como, Padua, and Verona, were a long time almost exclusively in their hands: other sees less frequently. — Beilage, xvii. p. 333.

² This must have been much later, as Nitger survived the Archbishop of Ravenna some time.

able, he is a dead man!" Humfred returned to Ravenna, fell ill, and in a few days died, not without strong suspicions of poison.¹

The third journey of Leo IX. beyond the Alps was as mediator between the Emperor Henry and Andrew King of Hungary. Fifty years had elapsed since that formidable people the Hungarians had been converted to Christianity. St. Stephen, their king, had wrought this almost sudden change. Stephen was the son of a Christian mother, Sarolta, herself the daughter of Gyula, who had been converted by a monk of Constantinople, Hierotheus. King Geisa, father of Stephen, seems to have hovered between the old Magyar religion of his subjects and his new faith. Stephen was not baptized in his infancy; the holy St. Adalbert administered to him that redeeming rite; he received the Christian name of Stephen; he obtained the hand of a Christian bride, Gisela, the daughter of the Emperor Otho. On the death of Geisa, an insurrection of the Magyars against the foreign councils and the foreign faith was suppressed. The Christian King ascended the throne; his first act was to unite himself to Latin Christendom; he sent an embassy to Pope Sylvester II., and received the present of a crown, and a Papal edict empowering him to regulate the ecclesiastical offices of his realm. He was crowned King of Hungary at Gran. Throughout the land rose churches: the nation received the religion of their Sovereign. Stephen, during his reign of thirty years, continued in the practice of that faith

Stephen
King, 1000-
1058.
1052, Leo's
third journey
to Germany.
Conversion of
Hungary.

¹ Gfrörer, with somewhat dubious charity, labors to exculpate the Pope from all share in this crime, of which no candid man can have the least suspicion. He lays it to the hostility of the Italians, who were jealous of their bishoprics being turned into German fortresses for the oppression of Italy.

and of those virtues, which acquired for him the name and renown of a saint. But Peter, the successor of Stephen, did not rule, he was ruled by German and Italian priests. The rude and warlike people had indignantly thrown off the yoke. The unhappy king was dethroned, blinded; Andrew and Levanta, two princes of the royal race, were placed on the throne; heathenism became again the national religion; everywhere the old altars rose; the Christians were persecuted; some priests and bishops suffered martyrdom. But on the death of Levanta, Andrew boldly declared himself a Christian; he was crowned by a Christian bishop (probably the native bishops had been permitted to remain); he restored the churches, and prohibited heathenism on pain of death.

The Emperor Henry had espoused the cause of the dethroned Peter; on his death he declared Hungary a fief of the empire. Andrew offered tribute, it was rejected with scorn. At the instigation of Henry, himself engaged in the war with Godfrey of Lorraine, his uncle Gebhard, Bishop of Ratisbon, led a marauding expedition into Hungary. He was defeated; but the Count of Bavaria and Adalbert Margrave of Austria entered into the war. It was waged with greater yet not with conclusive success. Haimbourg the frontier town was taken and retaken. Henry himself in the year 1051 headed a campaign without important result, the next year he advanced with a more overwhelming force, and laid siege to Presburg. Pope Leo appeared in his camp to reconcile the temporal head of Christendom¹ with a king who had restored the Christianity of

¹ An Hungarian prelate, Coloczy, had been among the bishops present at Toul, perhaps as ambassador, secret or avowed, of King Andrew to the Pope. Compare throughout Mailath, *Geschichte der Magyaren*.

his realm. But his mediation was rejected by Aug. Sept. both parties. He urged on the Emperor the terms of submission and tribute, offered by the Hungarians; Henry coldly and contemptuously declined the conditions. But the tide of war turned, the Hungarians sunk the provision ships on the Danube, upon which the army of the Emperor depended for their subsistence; and now the Hungarian in his turn refused the humiliating concessions which he had offered before. The Pope withdrew, not without some loss of dignity; the peace was not established till the following year, and then without his interference. At Ratisbon during the close of this year Pope Leo pursued his favorite avocation, the canonization of Saints. Two bishops of that city, Erhard and Wolfgang, were installed in that honor with the usual imposing ceremony.

Christmas was celebrated by the Pope and the Emperor, and many of the great prelates of Germany, at Worms. They met not merely to celebrate A.D. 1052. the birth of the Redeemer with more than Pope Leo at Worms. usual magnificence, but on secular affairs of great, it appeared of vital importance to the Pope. Leo, though maintaining his hold on Transalpine Christendom, had not neglected the affairs of Italy. Those affairs in which he appeared in a new character, and of which he was perhaps the victim, must be unfolded hereafter. He aspired it is clear to restore the Pope to his rank as an Italian Potentate, to become something more than a secular vassal of the empire, something beyond the spiritual monarch of Christendom. The See of Rome laid claim to many wealthy churches and abbeys,¹ either

¹ See the list of 31 churches and 47 monasteries, besides some allodial estates, in Muratori's *Antiq.* v. Dissert. 96. — Hoefer, p. 367. —

as the pious donations of the founders, or as the grants of emperors. Among these were the famous Abbey of Fulda, and the bishopric of Bamberg.¹ Leo agreed to surrender these endowments in exchange for the city and territory of Benevento, stipulating at the same time for a strong imperial force to put him in possession of that city, and to enable him to subdue the formidable and hostile Normans.

But the Antipapal party at the court of Henry had grown in strength and in bitterness of hostility; the more the Pope became an Italian, and the more he asserted his independence, the more odious he became to the great German prelates. His most attached friend and most powerful supporter, the holy and charitable Bardos, the Archbishop of Mentz, was dead; the Emperor of his own authority had appointed Liutpold, Provost of the Chapter of Bamberg, to this German primacy. The Pope had bestowed, in order to propitiate the new primate, some further privileges on the See of Mentz. The archbishop was the Papal Legate in his own diocese. But as if he knew the character of Liutpold, he took the opportunity of this grant to remind him of the duties of his function. A trifling incident betrayed the mutual jealousy of the German and Italian churchmen, the difficult position of the Pope, who having rashly favored the insolent superiority of the Italians, was obliged to humble himself before the sullen obstinacy of the Germans. In the mass for Christmas day, the Pope read the service, the next day the Archbishop of Mentz, the Metropolitan of Worms, performed the function. The pro-

Bamberg,
Oct. 18.

¹ Gfrörer conjectures that the Bishopric of Bamberg was attached to the Papacy on the promotion of Clement the Second.

cession was ended, the archbishop had taken his seat, Humbert, a deacon of the archbishop, chanted the Gospel in a tone different from the Roman usage, perhaps jarring to Italian ears. The Italians requested the Pope to forbid him from proceeding in his dissonant chant: the Pope did so, but the deacon went on, disregarding the Papal mandate. The Pope allowed the Gospel to be ended, summoned the refractory deacon, and declared him deposed from his office: the archbishop instantly sent some of his clergy to demand the restoration of his deacon; the Pope declined. The service went on, it was the time for the elevation of the Host. The archbishop sat stubbornly in his seat, and declared that neither he himself, nor any other should proceed with the office. The whole ceremony paused; the Pope was obliged to yield, his apologists said because he would not interfere with the rights of a metropolitan in his own diocese. The deacon was reinvested in his functions; the archbishop condescended to discharge the rest of his holy office.

But this, humiliating as it was, was not the most fatal mark of jealousy displayed by German churchmen against the unpopular Pontiff. At a council at Mantua, suddenly broken off, were undisguised A.D. 1053. Quinquagesima. signs of German hostility.¹ Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstadt, who was of great weight in the councils of the Emperor, persuaded him to withdraw the greater part of the troops, which were to march with the Pope

¹ At the council of Mantua the uproar against the Pope was not on account of the married clergy, against whom stronger measures were threatened, but the attempt of the Pope to obtain a sponge declared to contain the blood of the Lord. This accompanied the reliques of S. Longinus, the soldier who pierced the side with his spear. Compare Theiner, vol. ii. p. 32.

into Italy, and put him in possession of Benevento.¹ The Pope had influence enough to retain in his service 500 Swabian knights. With these, and assembling around his standard, as he went, a host of lawless adventurers and mercenaries, the holy Leo marched through Italy to appear at the head of his own forces, the first or almost the first martial pope, against the terrible Normans. The Italian policy of Leo, bold, aggressive to a certain degree, had been justified by success. In the reconquest of Sardinia from a new invasion of the Saracens, his admonitions and advice had encouraged the Pisans to achieve the conquest. In the neighborhood of Rome he had not been able to subdue the fierce barons, who still maintained the fastness cities, and awaited their time: a Crescentius still held Tusculum. But Southern Italy offered a more promising field for the extension and consolidation of his sovereignty. It was held by three powers mortally hostile to each other, the Greeks, the Saracens, and the Normans. Of these the Saracens, by recent feuds, had been so weakened, that Leo, in his lofty visions, began to dream of the reconquest of Sicily to Christendom. The Greeks, almost in despair of maintaining their ground against the Norman adventurers, had vainly sought recourse in craft. They endeavored to bribe them with enormous pay to enter into their service and engage in new wars in the East. But the Normans knew their strength: this body of men, who had arrived in Italy as pilgrims, had now become sovereigns of many cities; they warred impartially on all.² The

¹ Floto (*Kaiser Heinrich der Vierte*, i. p. 179, published 1856) assigns some reasons, the dangers and difficulties of Henry in Germany, for that advice.

² On the settlement of the Normans in Italy read the curious chronicle,

deliverance of Southern Italy from these half christianized and barbarous freebooters seemed to justify to Pope Leo even his warlike propensities. His first incursion into the South had been of a more peaceful, more seemly character; but it had opened to his ambition views which matured slowly to the close of his life. In the second year of his pontificate, he had again visited Monte Casino, and held a synod at Salerno. At his approach the city of Benevento threw off May, 1050.

the yoke of its sovereign prince, Landulf of Capua. Leo hesitated not to accept the popular surrender; and to receive the city as part of the domain of St. Peter. The faction of the Capuan regained possession, Leo excommunicated the rebellious city. He was now by the Imperial grant Lord of Benevento. He was at the head of an army, enlisted to expel the Normans from the land. He wrote to the Greek Emperor, Constantine Monomachus, to declare the reasons which urged him to undertake this war in person. In his martial ardor he forgot the theologic controversy,¹ which was rising to its height with the patriarch of Constantinople Michael Cerularius; the controversy, which prolonged

‘Li Normans,’ published by M. Champollion Figeac. Soc. de l’Histoire de France.

¹ For this controversy between Humbert Cardinal Bishop of Silva Candida, legate at Constantinople, and the clergy of Constantinople, which ended in haughty words on both sides, see Leonis Epist. apud Mansi xix. Canisii Lectiones Antiq. One of the strongest objections against the Greek Church was the marriage of her clergy. The Latin replies: “Hæc cunctæ quoque sunt illa majora et perfectiora, ut novus maritus et recente carnis voluptate resolutus et totus marcidus Christi ministret altaribus, et ab ejus immaculato corpore sanctificando manus confestim ad muliebres transferat amplexus. . . . Pro quibus omnibus et aliis, quos longum est scripto prosequi erroribus, nisi resipitis et digne satisfeceritis, irrevocabile anathema hic et in futuro eritis a Deo et ab omnibus Catholicis, pro quibus Christus animam suam posuit.” — Compare the answer by Nicetas. Apud Canis. pp. 301-314

for centuries the schism between the Greek and Latin churches. While the vital question as to the nature of the Sacrament threatened to distract the West, the East broke off all connection with a church which dared to use unleavened bread in that solemn rite. The Normans, thus wrote Leo to the Emperor, that undisciplined and foreign race, were still ravaging Christian Italy with more than Pagan impiety; they spared neither age nor sex, and not merely slew the Christians indiscriminately in promiscuous fray, but put them to death slowly with indescribable tortures. They made no distinction between things sacred and profane; they plundered, burned, razed churches. Princes, according to the apostles, were not to bear the sword in vain; and as a prince Leo went out to war; not that he desired the death of a single Norman, nor of any human being, but by the terrors of human judgments, these unbelievers must be taught the terms of God's judgments.¹

In his youthful days, Leo had acquired some fame for military conduct; he had commanded the vassals of the bishopric of Toul in one of the Emperor Conrad's expeditions into Italy. Some vain self-confidence may have mingled with the zeal which induced him to lead his own army against the enemies of the faith² — an act at which some of the more religious stood amazed, and did not disguise their utter repugnance. The stern recluse Peter Damiani protested with all his natural energy.³

¹ Leo IX. Epist. Constant. Monomach. vii.; Labbe, p. 982.

² "In illius itaque sæcularis militiæ dispositione, sic repente sagax apparuit et providus, quasi hujusmodi negotiis tantum fuisset hactenus exercitatus." — Wibert, i. 7.

³ Damiani lays down this irrefragable proposition: "Si ergo pro Fide, quæ universalis vivit Ecclesia, nusquam ferrea corripitur arma conceditur, quomodo pro terrenis ac transitoriis Ecclesiæ facultatibus loricatæ acies in

The conduct of Leo in the campaign belied his early fame. The sagacity and forethought, formerly ascribed to him, utterly failed. Not that he actually took the generalship of his troops in the battle, but all the movements seem to have been made under his guidance. From San Germano he advanced to Capua, accompanied by many bishops, by Frederick of Lorraine the Chancellor of the Empire, the Duke of Gaeta, the Counts of Aquino and Teano. Thence he marched into the Capitanata, the stronghold of the Normans. The Apulians and other Italians flocked to his standard. He had an interview with Argyrous, the Greek Catapan of Calabria, who promised his succor. He fixed his quarters at Civitella, and launched his first ^{June 18,} blow, the excommunication of the Normans. ^{1053.}

The Normans either were, or pretended to be, appalled by these vast preparations. They offered terms of submission. These were peremptorily refused by Frederick of Lorraine: the only condition offered was their total abandonment of Italy. The Pope saw not the danger of driving them to despair. He pushed forward his troops to the banks of the Furtorio, near Dragonata. The German troops were not above 500. The terrible Normans mustered 3,000 knights, men who were said to be able to cleave an enemy from the head to the saddle

gladios debacchantur. "When the saints have power they do not even slay heretics and infidels." He proceeds to condemn Leo IX.: "Ad hæc si quis objiciat, bellicis usibus Leonem se frequenter implicuisse Pontificem, veruntamen sanctum esse. Dico quod sentio, quoniam nec Petrus ob hoc Apostolicum obtinet principatum, quia negavit; nec David idcirco prophetice meretur oraculum, quia torum alieni viri invasit." It is curious to read Damiani's commentator, trying to make out that Damiani does not condemn the Pope's using the sword as a temporal prince. How would the old Saint, who compared Leo's wars with the denial of Peter, and the adultery of David, have scorned this distinction? — Damiani, *Epist.* iv. 9.

with one blow. They were commanded by the sons of Tancred, Humfrey, Richard of Aversa, and the yet unrenowned Robert Guiscard. Three days the armies watched each other. While the negotiations were pending, the Normans occupied a hill, on which depended the fate of the battle. The fourth day they burst down in three squadrons. The Lombards, on one wing, the Apulians on the other, fled at once: the Germans were surrounded and cut to pieces to a man.

The Normans rushed from the field to seize the Pope at Civitella. An accidental conflagration repelled them for that night: the next day they entered the town. The humbled Pope at once relieved them from their excommunication: they became again sons of the Church. Was it religious awe, or was it subtle policy, which made them at once her obsequious sons? The rude soldiery perhaps from dread, the leaders from that craft in which the Normans excelled as much as in valor, cast themselves down before the Pope, entreated his pardon, professed deep penitence. But they lost no time in securing again all the cities which had thrown off their yoke. Count Humfrey, the gentlest of the sons of Tancred, remained as gaoler, or as an attendant on the Pope. Leo was allowed to visit the battle-field,¹ to bury his own soldiers with the honors of martyrs. He declared that he had heavenly visions of their glory, as having died for the faith. The Normans themselves afterwards assisted in building a church over their remains. The Pope was conducted with all respect by Count Humfrey to Benevento: there he remained, a

¹ The battle was fought June 16, 1053. Leo set off for Rome March 12, 1054.

prisoner, though treated with the most profound outward reverence, for some months.

Heart-broken at the failure of all his schemes ; perhaps now conscious of his own unclerical conduct, in becoming the leader of an army ; seeing the divine condemnation in his abasement, his imprisonment, notwithstanding the courteous and deferential demeanor of the Normans ; knowing that he was absolutely in their power, the pious Leo betook himself to the severest acts of penitential austerity. He wore nothing but sackcloth ; he slept on a carpet, with a stone for his pillow, the few hours which he allowed for sleep. Every day he performed mass ; almost all the rest of the day and night was passed in prayer and the recital of the Psalter. He did not absolutely neglect his ecclesiastical functions ; he appointed a new abbot of Santa Sophia, in Benevento. He kept up a correspondence with Africa, with Constantinople, with the most remote parts of Latin Christendom ; but his chief occupation, besides his prayers, was works of charity. His admirers glorify his imprisonment with many miracles. But his sorrow and his macerations had wasted all his strength ; the hand of death was upon him. The Normans, perhaps out of compassion, perhaps lest they should be accused of the death of the Pope while in their hands, were willing to release the dying man. On the 12th of March he left Benevento, under the escort of the Norman Humfrey. He was obliged to rest twelve days at Capua. He arrived at Rome, but repressed the universal joy by melancholy intimations of his approaching death, too visibly confirmed by his helpless condition. His calm departure reaches sublimity. He ordered his coffin to be carried to St. Peter's ;

he reposed on a couch by its side. There he gave his last admonitions to the ecclesiastics around, entreating them to abstain from simony and the alienation of the estates of the Church ; there he received the last sacraments. He rose with difficulty, and looked into his coffin. "Behold, my brethren, the mutability of human things. The cell which was my dwelling when a monk expanded into yonder spacious palace ; it shrinks again into this narrow coffin." The next morning he was dead. He died before the altar of St. Peter's. As might be expected, his death had been announced by visions : monks had beheld in their dreams angels in white robes by his bed-side. Wonderful cures immediately followed his departure. A devil, who had possessed a Tuscan woman for above nine years, confessed that Leo had already ascended to heaven, and that it was by his power that he was driven forth. A woman laughed this tale to scorn ; she was seized by the expelled fiend and compelled to pray to the new Saint. The lame, the dumb, the lepers, were brought from all parts of Italy to touch his remains. Churches were built to his honor in Benevento, in Toul, and in many other cities.

April 13,
1054.

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUATION OF GERMAN POPES.

HILDEBRAND having concluded his hasty treaty with Berengar, but not leading with him, as he had threatened, the captive heretic, travelled with the utmost speed to Rome. Pope Leo, it is said, had bequeathed the administration of the see, during the vacancy, to the Cardinal-subdeacon ; but tumults were threatened, or actually broke out : the party of Benedict, the old Roman party, was not extinct. According to one account, it made a bold attempt to regain its power. Hildebrand was too wise as yet to aspire to the unsafe dignity. The Pope must be a wealthy prelate, for the larger part of the papal domains were still in the hands of the baronial plunderers. An Italian pope of the most awful piety, of the most determined energy, would only have wielded spiritual weapons, to which those lawless men had been too long habituated, not to laugh them to scorn. The Pope must command the imperial protection, without which Rome might at any time become the prey of the Normans. That terrible race had again resumed their hostile aspect ; their ally, the Count of Reate, had not scrupled to seize and imprison, on their return from Constantinople, the future Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine and the other legates of Pope Leo. The Pope would have become the slave, he had not yet learned

the wiser policy of being the patron and ally of these barbarians. After some months it was determined to send an embassy to the Emperor, at the head of which was Hildebrand himself, to implore his nomination. But Hildebrand had already determined upon his choice — a Pope who might meet the exigencies of the times, and whose election would so flatter the Emperor, that he would hardly refuse to concur cordially in the appointment. Gebhard of Eichstadt was one of the richest, undoubtedly the ablest of the German prelates. Gebhard might be considered the remote cause of the discomfiture of Leo at Civitella, and of his premature death. He it was who had advised the Emperor to countermand the march of the great body of his troops to the support of Leo. He had veiled this act of jealous hostility to Leo under affected scorn of the Normans; “with two hundred knights he would chase them from Italy.” If Gebhard could command the German troops to retire, he could command them to advance in these perilous times to the rescue of Rome.

The rise of Gebhard of Eichstadt to power and influence had been rapid and extraordinary. Gebhard, Bishop of Ratisbon, the uncle of the Emperor, had demanded for his favorite, Cuno, the succession to his see. From some latent cause, on the pretext that Cuno was the son of a married priest, Henry refused the nomination, but endeavored to propitiate his uncle by leaving the appointment absolutely in his power. The Bishop of Ratisbon immediately named Gebhard, a remote descendant of the noble house of Calw. To the Emperor’s objection against his extreme youth, the bishop replied with prophetic sagacity, that Gebhard would rise to still higher honors. This vaticination

began immediately to give promise of fulfilment. The Bishop of Eichstadt showed consummate abilities ; he was of the greatest service to the Emperor in most difficult circumstances, particularly during the Hungarian war. He became his most intimate and confidential counsellor.

It was a great stroke of policy to secure the full exertion of the imperial power for the reinstatement of the Pope in the dignity and security of his office ; to repel the Normans, perhaps to wrest back from their unworthy possessors some of the estates of the see : while at the same time it deprived the Emperor of a counsellor who was most likely to give success to his policy, to the German policy, of retaining the Pope in obsequious vassalage to the Empire. It might be boldly predicted from the ambition and abilities of such a Pope as Gebhard, that after the great work of the reëstablishment of the papacy was completed, the Churchman, as in his predecessors, would predominate over the faithful subject, the Italian Pope over the German Liegeman. Gebhard foresaw the danger, shrank from the temptation ; he had rather remain the commanding counsellor than the equal, the rival, it might be the enemy, of his master. He yielded to the pressing entreaties of Hildebrand and the Romans, and of his Imperial sovereign, only after long delay, only on the significant terms that the Emperor would restore the rights and possessions which he held belonging to the Papacy. This speech implied the pledge of his assistance to recover those usurped by others. A whole year had ^{April 13,} elapsed before the successor of Leo IX. was inaugurated at Rome under the name of Victor II.

The Emperor followed his Pope into Italy at the

head of an imposing and powerful array. But a new enemy had arisen, if not more formidable, more hateful to the Emperor than the Normans or the usurpers of the Papal estates. Godfrey the Bearded, the deposed Duke of Lorraine, had been Henry's ancient antagonist. Godfrey, anathematized by Leo IX., deserted by his allies, had submitted to the loss of his hereditary dukedom; he had led an aimless and adventurous life. One of the acts which was considered as betraying hostility to the Emperor in Pope Leo, had been the elevation of Godfrey's brother, Frederick of Lorraine, to the Cardinalate, and to the highest honors of the Church. Godfrey had accompanied his brother, the Cardinal Legate, on his mission to Constantinople. On his return he married Beatrice, the widow of Boniface, Marquis of A.D. 1052. Tuscany, who had been murdered a few years before. The whole inheritance of that family, the most powerful in Italy, the inheritance which, afterwards falling to the famous Countess Matilda, was the great source of the independence and overweening power of Gregory VII., was at the command of the Emperor's implacable enemy. The depression of the house of Lorraine was the one object which now occupied the Emperor. The mother and her daughter fell into his hands. Godfrey of Lorraine was forced to abandon his Italian possessions; he fled to Germany, to stir up more perilous revolt against the Imperial authority. The Cardinal Frederick, pursued by the implacable jealousy of the Emperor, did not find himself safe even in the holy sanctuary of Monte Casino. He took refuge in a more unapproachable monastery in the rocky island of Thermania, to emerge in a short time, under other circumstances, as the Supreme Pontiff.

Pope Victor II. held a council in the presence of the Emperor at Florence, then an unimportant MAY 27. city. Besides the ordinary denunciation against simoniacal proceedings, and a new sentence against the excommunicated Berengar, a decree was passed which attempted to strike at the root of that evil which impoverished the papacy, broke up the Church property into small pieces, and made laymen the actual possessors of the estates of the Church. It prohibited, under pain of excommunication, all bishops and abbots from granting the estates of the Church as fiefs to knights or nobles. The Pope set the example of this new proceeding; on the falling in of the fief of Spoleto and Camerina, he became himself the Marquis. He proceeded, no doubt under the awe of the protection of his imperial master, to resume other lands which had been rashly and fraudulently granted away in the more turbulent periods to the barons of the Romagna.

But, whether from his severity in the condemnation of simony, the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline, or the threatened resumption of the estates of the Church, the Italian hatred to a German pope soon found a man bold and guilty enough to endeavor the murder of Victor. A subdeacon mingled poison even with the blood of the Lord in the Eucharist; the story took the form of legend; the Pope could not lift the chalice; he entreated the prayers of the faithful to enable him to investigate the cause of this wonder; the affrighted culprit fell on his knees and confessed, or, as it was said, the demon who possessed him confessed his guilt.

The Emperor, on the news of threatened insurrection, had hastened back to Germany. Instead of de-

scending again in the next year to Italy, he sent messenger after messenger pressing the return of his one faithful and wise counsellor to Germany. The Empire was in open or secret revolt in many parts. Godfrey of Lorraine had organized an insurrection; France threatened war: the Pope hastened to the aid of his old master. He arrived at Goslar to receive his confession, to administer the last Sacraments. The Emperor, in consequence of violent exertion in the chase, had caught a fever, which, working on a mind harassed by the perplexing state of affairs, (Oct. 5, 1056. Oct. 28.) brought him to the grave. He died, forgiving all his enemies, making restitution of all which he had unjustly possessed, bequeathing his infant son to the care of the Pope. He was buried by the faithful Pope at Spires.

Victor II., Gebhard of Eichstadt, was now in power both Pope and Emperor; his wise moderation appeased the angry conflict in Germany. He reconciled Baldwin of Flanders to the young king by a timely concession of his hereditary dukedom. He allayed the enmity of Godfrey of Lorraine; he gave no offence to those who were most likely to take offence at this preëminent elevation of one of their own order, the great prelates of Germany; he raised the celebrated Adalbert into a metropolitan of Northern Germany, as Archbishop of Hamburg. He sent Hildebrand again into France to reform the Church, to depose the simoniacal prelates, to wrest the power and the wealth of the clergy out of the hands of the laity. In Italy it had already, before the Emperor's death, begun to appear that the Pope now wielded the power of the Empire. He had made a progress into the

Nov., Dec.,
1055.

March of Ancona as Duke of Spoleto and Marquis of Camerina and Fermo, and of the March of Ancona. He raised his tribunal, and was received with the utmost submission; many of the unruly barons attended obsequiously upon his court. He summoned the Count Teuto and his sons for unlawfully withholding the castle of La Vitice from the Bishop of Teramo. The contumacious Teuto not appearing, the judge of the Pope declared him in rebellion, pronounced against him the ban of the Empire and of the Pope, and gave orders to take the castle by force. These proceedings were not always carried out without strong murmurs. Peter Damiani, in one case thought himself called upon to intrude his remonstrances, and to admonish Pope Victor as to the observance of more equal justice. It was an ungrateful return to God who raised Victor to the favor of the Emperor, and had now invested him with imperial power, to abuse that power, to despoil unrightfully a man who had withdrawn from the world and dedicated himself to Christ.¹ But at the summons of Pope Victor a large Synod of bishops from Northern and Central Italy met at Florence ^{April 18,} ^{1057.} —those of Florence, Arezzo, Nocera, Castello, Popilia, Sienna, Vercelli, Turin, Eugubio, Velletri, Fiesole, Pisa, Pistoia. Of the acts of this Synod nothing is known, but the presentation of Frederick of Lorraine, fallen into such disgrace with the Emperor Henry III., but now wisely restored to favor, as Abbot of Monte Casino to the Pope. Frederick was received with the utmost courtesy, confirmed as abbot, and at the same time acknowledged as the Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus in

¹ Damiani, *Epist.* i. v. The circumstances to which Damiani alludes are unknown.

the Roman Church. The ambition of Victor rose with his power ; his grants assume a loftier tone ; the Apostolic throne of Peter, the chief of the Apostles, is raised high above all people and all realms, that he may pluck up and destroy, plant and build in his name. He was preparing again to cross the Alps to arrange, in his character of guardian of the Empire, with the Empress Agnes the affairs of Germany ; he was meditating a second great Council at Rheims, to accomplish the reform in the Church of France. July 28,
1057. He suddenly died at Arezzo, and with him expired all these magnificent schemes of universal rule.

When the unexpected intelligence of Pope Victor's death arrived at Rome, the Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine had not departed to Monte Casino. The death of Victor caused almost a vacancy in the Empire as well as in the Papacy. The Empress mother alone, now deprived of her ablest counsellor, and her young son, represented the Franconian Cæsars. The House of Lorraine was in the ascendant ; not only had Duke Godfrey been permitted to resume his hereditary rank and title, Victor, the Pope, had either from policy consented, or yielded through fear, to admit Godfrey and his wife Beatrice of Tuscany as joint representatives of the Empire, and as rulers of Italy. Frederick of Lorraine was not a Roman, not even an Italian, but he was the hereditary enemy of the Imperial House ; he had suffered persecution from the late Emperor. The Romans determined to seize the occasion of reasserting their privilege of themselves creating the Pope without regard to the permission or sanction of the Emperor. Hildebrand was absent ; and as they still hesitated, they consulted the Abbot of Monte Casino concerning the

future Pope. Frederick of Lorraine named no single prelate; he embarrassed them (if indeed the whole was not well understood between the parties) with the choice among five prelates, Humbert Cardinal Bishop of St. Rufino, the Bishops of Velletri, of Tusculum, and of Perugia, and the Subdeacon Hildebrand. It was proposed to await Hildebrand's return; but the dominant party would hear of no delay. They declared none of these to be equal to the Papacy; Frederick of Lorraine himself must be the Pope. "Be it as you will," said the unresisting Abbot, "ye can only do what God permits you to do." Five days after the death of Victor, Frederick, under the name ^{Stephen} of Stephen IX., was inaugurated in the church ^{Pope.} ^{Aug. 2, 1057.} of St. Peter ad Vincula, and installed amid universal joy in the Lateran Palace. Frederick of Lorraine was a churchman of the sternest and haughtiest views. As the Legate of Leo IX. at Constantinople, he had asserted the Roman supremacy in the strongest terms. He had anathematized the Byzantine Church in language which, notwithstanding that the policy of the reigning Emperor Constantine Monomachus, intent on retaining, as an ally of the Pope, his small remaining territory in the south of Italy, led him to endure any degradation of his Church by the representatives of the Pope, eventually tended to widen the irreparable breach between the East and West. He drew up, with his colleagues, a paper which he solemnly deposed on the high altar of St. Sophia, which, while it condescended to admit that among the pillars of the realm and the great dignitaries of the state, they had found much true faith and orthodox doctrine; the so-called Patriarch and his followers were sowing the seeds of all imaginable

heresies. Like the Simonists, they sold the grace of God: like the Valesians, they appointed men whom they had castrated not only to the priesthood but to the episcopate;¹ like the Arians, they rebaptized those who had been baptized before in the name of the Holy Trinity, even Latin Christians; like the Donatists, they declared that without the Church of Byzantium was no true Church, the sacraments were of none effect: like the Nicolaïtes, they permitted carnal union to priests; like the Severians, they declared the law of Moses accursed, and cut off from the article about the Holy Ghost his procession from the Son as from the Father: like the Manicheans, they asserted that whatever is leavened has life. Like the Nazarenes, they so highly respect the purification of the Jews, that they do not baptize children who die before the eighth day, and do not administer the communion to women who are in danger during childbirth; if heathens, do not baptize them. Finally, they do not, because they themselves wear their hair and beard long, admit to the communion those who, according to the Roman usage, clip their hair and shave their chins. "Accursed therefore be Michael, miscalled Patriarch, Leo Bishop of Acrida, and all their followers, with those of Simon, Vales, Donatus, Arius, Nicolaus, Severus, with all the enemies of God and the Holy Ghost, the Manicheans and Nazarenes, and all heretics, yea with the Devil and his Angels. Amen! amen! amen!" With this protest Frederick of Lorraine and the other legates had shaken the dust from their feet, and left guilty Constantinople.

The Abbot of Monte Casino was a rigid monk as

¹ Compare on this extraordinary charge against these Valesians (Valentinians, qu.?) the letter in Mansi.

well as a haughty churchman: the appointment of Peter Damiani, the austere champion of clerical celibacy, the sworn enemy of the married clergy, to the cardinalate, showed to the world the inclination of his mind on these great points, on which the Church was plunging into a mortal contest.

But the secular prince, the heir of a German dukedom, was not sunk either in the monk or in the churchman. Pope Stephen IX. had great schemes at once for the deliverance of Italy, for the elevation of his own family, perhaps some undetected desire of revenge against the house of his enemy, Henry III. He proposed, by the aid of Godfrey, now in possession of the marquisate of Tuscany, to expel the Normans from Italy, and afterwards to elevate Godfrey, the deliverer and master of Italy, to the Imperial throne. But great means were necessary to arm a force sufficiently powerful to subdue the Normans. The Abbot of Monte Casino (he was still Abbot) remembered the vast treasures which the piety of centuries had accumulated in the vaults of Monte Casino (though once plundered by the Saracens),¹ the votive offerings to St. Benedict, whom every devout monk considered his spiritual ancestor. He caused these treasures to be conveyed to Rome: he intended to devote them to this sacred crusade. But as he surveyed them religious terror seized his mind; visions were not wanting in which the holy Benedict and his sister Scolastica appeared to pious worshippers to protest against and to denounce this sacrilegious alienation of their riches. In an agony of remorse the Pope sent back the whole, except one picture, which himself had brought from Constantinople. The

¹ Leo Ostien.

secret of this conduct is clear : it was the consciousness of failing health which repressed the bold ambition of the Pope. On St. Andrew's day, but four months after his election, he had retired to Monte Casino. At Christmas, 1057, mas he was seized with a violent illness, and was at the point of death. Already had he begun to take measures for the administration of affairs after his decease. On his return to Rome in February, Feb. 10, 1058. an access of returning health reawakened his paralyzed ambition. But the hand of death was upon him. He set off for Florence, turned aside to visit the holy Gualberto in his retirement at Vallombrosa, and after a few days died in his arms.

The death of Stephen IX. was no sooner announced in Rome than each faction took its measures. The Imperial party sent a submissive message to the Empress Agnes, laying the nomination at the feet of her and of her son. But the old Roman feudatory barons, who had been already compelled to relax their hold on some of the wealth of the Church, saw at once their opportunity to seize the Papal election again into their own hands. The minority of the Emperor gave them courage. The Count of Tusculum, the Count of Galeria, the Crescentii of Monticello rose without delay. John Mincius, the Cardinal Bishop of Velletri, had been one of the five prelates named by Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine on the death of Victor II. : he was of the famous house of Crescentius. Him they persuaded or compelled to accept the dignity. He was hastily inaugurated, enthroned by night, and took the name of Benedict X. From him they proceeded to extort the most lavish grants. They plundered the treasures, no doubt on the specious pretext of purchasing the good-

will of the people. The sacred oblations of St. Peter were not secure; the hammer of the coiner was heard beating up those holy ornaments into money. The cardinals present protested, and fled from Rome. Cardinal Humbert of St. Sabina and Peter of Tusculum returned from the burial of the Pope: they found Benedict on the throne, the Romans submitting to a Roman Pope. They withdrew in all haste to Florence, to concert measures with him whose master-mind they had begun to acknowledge. Hildebrand was accidentally at the Imperial Court, on a mission from the late Pope; he would have no difficulty in rousing the resentment of the Empress against this usurpation, this insult, after the nomination had been offered by the Romans. She empowered him to proceed to a new election. Hildebrand alleged the specious reason of visiting the tomb of his late benefactor, the deceased Stephen IX., to delay in Florence. There he enlisted in the same cause the ancient enemy of the Imperial House and of the Empress, Godfrey of Lorraine, the Marquis of Tuscany. Rivals for the Empire, these two potentates had a common interest in wresting the appointment to the Papacy from the lawless Romans, a common worldly interest, if not a religious dread of seeing the Papacy, notwithstanding the high character of the Pontiff elect, designated by the former Pope as one of the five most worthy ecclesiastics, sink to its former degradation. The choice skilfully adapted itself to the hopes and passions of both parties. It was Gerard, a Burgundian, a fellow-student of the Lorrainer the late Pope Stephen IX., now the Archbishop of Florence, and therefore connected no doubt with Godfrey, who heartily concurred in the choice.¹

¹ Annitente Gothofredo duce. — Leo Ostien. iii. 12.

The price of the concurrence of the Empress was a secret stipulation to crown her son as Emperor. The anti-Pope took the name of Nicolas II. He moved to Sutri, escorted by Godfrey of Tuscany, supported by Guibert of Parma the Chancellor of the Empire, whom he had summoned to attend at Sutri in a council of Jan. 1059. bishops. Pope Benedict was declared excommunicate, Nicolas II. the rightful Pope. Resistance was vain. Nicolas II. advanced to Rome: he was received with apparent joy by the clergy and the people; the barons had disappeared with their plunder.

The Pontificate of Nicolas II. witnessed the two great changes in the Papal policy, which laid the foundations of its vast mediæval power — the decree for the election of the Pope by the Cardinals of Rome, and the alliance with the Normans. With the aid of the Hagarenes (so are the Normans called) Nicolas besieged his rival in Galeria. The Count of that fortress repented of his rashness in offering protection to the Pope Benedict. Benedict ascended the walls; he began to make signs, to utter curses against the Roman people. “You have forced me, against my will, to be your Pope; give me security for my life, and I will renounce the Pontificate.” Thirty Roman nobles pledged themselves as his guarantees for life and limb, for his safe reception in Rome. Nicolas, at the head of his army, returned to Rome; his rival followed, having stripped himself of his pontifical robes, and found a retreat with his mother, who lived near the April 13. Church of S. Maria Maggiore. Thirty days after Hildebrand the archdeacon seized him by force, and placed him before Nicolas and a council in the Lateran church. They stripped him before the altar

of his pontifical robes (in which he had been again invested), set him thus despoiled before the synod, put a writing in his hand, containing a long confession of every kind of wickedness. He resisted a long time, knowing himself perfectly innocent of such crimes: he was compelled to read it with very many tears and groans. His mother stood by, her hair dishevelled, and her bosom bare, with many sobs and lamentations. His kindred stood weeping around. Hildebrand then cried aloud to the people,—"These are the deeds of the Pope whom ye have chosen!" They rearrayed him in the pontifical robes, and formally deposed him. He was allowed to retire to the monastery of S. Agnes, where he lived in the utmost wretchedness. They prohibited him from all holy functions, would not allow him to enter the choir. By the intercession of the Archpresbyter of S. Anastasia, he was permitted at length to read the Epistle; a short time after, the Gospel; but never suffered to celebrate mass. He lived to the Pontificate of Hildebrand, who, when informed of his death, said, "In evil hour did I behold him; I have committed a great sin." Hildebrand commanded that he should be buried with pontifical honors.¹

Immediately on his accession, while he was yet in his strength, supported both by the Imperial power and by the Marquis of Tuscany, while Rome and the barons were depressed by their late discomfiture, Nicolas II. summoned a council, the second Lateran ^{A.D. 1059.} council in Rome. A hundred and thirteen ^{April 13.} bishops obeyed the call. The first decree of this

¹ *Annales Romani*, first, I believe, published by Pertz, vol. v. Pertz thinks that these annals had been seen by Baronius.

assembly wrested at once the power of nominating the Pope from the lower clergy, the turbulent barons, and the populace. It left to the people and to the Emperor a barren approbation, but it vested the actual election solely in the higher clergy. With the cardinal bishops was the initiative; the assent of the cardinal priests and deacons was first required, then that of the laity, and finally that of the Emperor.¹ The higher spiritual aristocracy took the lead, the others were to be their humble followers.² Besides this, it established a kind of prerogative right in the Roman clergy to the Pontificate: only in default of a fit person within that Church was a stranger to be admitted to the honor. Rome was to be the place of election; but even Rome, by tumult or by contumacy, might forfeit her privilege. Wherever the cardinals were assembled, there was Rome. It had been at Sienna or at Sutri. In case the election could not take place within the city — and of this they were the sole judges — the cardinals, assisted by some of the religious clergy and religious laity, even though few (their religion would be their fidelity to their party), might proceed elsewhere to the election. The Imperial rights were reserved vaguely and ambiguously.³

¹ "Nimirum cum Electio illa per Episcoporum Cardinalium fieri debeat principale *judicium*; secundo loco jure præbeat clericus *assensum*; tertio popularis favor attollat *applausum*; sicque suspendenda est causa, usque dum regiæ celsitudinis consularur auctoritas: nisi, sicut nuper contigit, periculum fortassis immineat, quod rem quantocyus accelerare compellat." — Peter Damian. i. Epist. xx.

² "Et ideo religiosissimi viri præduces sint in promovendâ pontificis electione: reliqui autem sequaces." The religiositas unhappily was estimated solely by rank in the Church.

³ "Cardinales Episcopi, cum religiosis clericis, Catholicisque Laicis, *licet paucis*, jus potestatis obtineant eligere Apostolicæ sedis pontificem, ubi congruere viderint." — Conc. ii. Lateran. Throughout, however, there is a

This decree, and an anathema of more than usual terror (the most dreadful imprecations in the Scripture were selected with sedulous care), was ratified by the consent of all, by the signature of above 70 bishops, with many other ecclesiastics. The anathema condemned the offender against the statute to irrevocable excommunication, to be counted among the wicked to all eternity. "May he endure the wrath of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that of St. Peter, and St. Paul, in this life and the next! May his house be desolate, and no one dwell in his tents! Be his children orphans, his wife a widow, his sons outcasts and beggars! May the usurer consume his substance, the stranger reap his labors; may all the world and all the elements war upon him, and the merits of all the saints which sleep in the Lord confound and inflict visible vengeance during this life! Whosoever, on the other hand, shall keep this law, by the authority of St. Peter is absolved from all his sins." Yet two years were hardly passed, when on the death of Nicholas a contested election distracted the Church of Rome; and some of the subscribing bishops are found in each furious faction.

The same Council, the second Lateran Council, which had thus made provision for the unity of the church by a new form of election, which had wrung the misused power from a lawless and irresponsible body, and seemed to repose it in security in the most holy and intelligent of the sacerdotal order; aspired also to establish the endangered unity of doctrine, and authoritatively to decide the most perilous theolog-

respectful reservation of the imperial right: "*Salvo debito honore et reverentiâ Henrici, qui in presentiarum rex habetur, et futurus imperator speratur.*" The last clause cited above has in the copy in Pertz: "*Ubi cum rege congruentius judicaverunt.*" — Pertz, Leges, ii. App. p. 177.

ical controversy which had arisen in Latin Christendom. Berengar of Tours had been persuaded or compelled to appear before the Lateran Council. He had his choice between death and the recantation of his tenets. But logic makes no martyrs. The temperament of Berengar's mind was not that of a reckless fanatic.¹ He fairly confesses that the fear of death extracted from him the humiliating admission of his errors; he accepted a creed equivocal according to his view, and elusive of the main question, in which the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist was distinctly asserted, though not in the strongest terms of transubstantiation. No sooner was he beyond the power of his adversaries, than Berengar recanted his recantation; reassumed the contemptuous language of a superior mind towards Pope Nicolas himself; reasserted the doctrines of his master Erigena, whom in the presence of danger he had not hesitated to forswear. But though the decree of the Lateran Council had no effect on Berengar, it had for a short time the effect of almost suppressing his doctrine.² Yet as will appear, it was not altogether swallowed up in the more absorbing question, the marriage of the clergy.

¹ Compare Berengar's own account of these proceedings: he claims the victory, and boastfully avers that, by their own terms, the bread, as he had always asserted, remains after consecration. — p. 70 *et seq.* "*Dum dicitur, panis in altari consecratio, vel panis sanctus, panis sacrosanctus est Christi corpus, omni veritate panis superesse conceditur.*"

² Among the most bold of Berengar's assertions was his protest against the assumption so perpetually made, that a certain doctrine, because supported by the majority, is the doctrine of the whole Church. He boasts multitudes who hold his opinions: "*Quod nomen Ecclesiæ totiens ineptorum multitudini tribuis, facis contra sensa majorum: — quod dicis omnes tenere hanc fidem — contra conscientiam tuam dicis, quam latere non potest, usque eo res agitata est, quam plurimos aut pæne infinitos esse cujuscunque ordinis, qui tuum de sacrificio Ecclesiæ execrantur errorem, atque Pascasii Corbejensis Monachi.*" p. 27.

By the decree of the Lateran Council the popedom was restored to Italy, to Rome. The great organized and simultaneous effort of the higher Clergy, to become as it were the chief feudatories and to choose their monarch had been successful. But the decree of a Council was only a mass of idle words, unless the Papacy could command some strong military force to secure its independence against domestic and against foreign foes. Either the Emperor must still dictate, or the Roman barons overawe the election. The Pope with all his magnificent pretensions was but a defenceless vassal, a vassal dependent on foreign resources for his maintenance on his throne.

The second great act of the pontificate of Nicolas II. was the conversion of the hostile, the unbelieving Normans, into the faithful allies, the body guard of the Pope. The Normans were now in almost undisputed possession of the whole of Southern Italy; the Greek Argyrous, the last Catapan, the ally of Leo IX., had retired in despair, finding his dominions almost shrunk to the one faithful city of Reggio at the very verge of Calabria, to Constantinople. The Normans were not less politic than brave; they were not without superstition; their policy and their superstition might render them the allies, the protectors of the Papacy. Robert Guiscard, the most powerful of the Norman princes, no doubt knowing how such advances would be received, sent an embassy

*Alliance
with the
Normans,
June 24,
1059.*

to Rome, to request the revocation of the ban of excommunication, still in force against his Normans. The Pope made a progress, partly of a spiritual, partly of a secular character, into the South. He held a synod at Melfi; the extirpation of concubinage, universal among

the Neapolitan clergy, was the pretext;¹ the Norman treaty the real object. The Normans wanted a more imposing title than that of conquest to their Italian possessions. They were not disposed to question the right of one, who was on his part disposed to make such title on his own authority. The Pope wanted the Norman aid; he scrupled not to advance the enormous pretension of a seignorial suzerainty over the whole kingdom of Naples, how devolved and how obtained, or on what ground, no one ever presumed or cared to inquire, and no one as yet has been able to answer, though few for centuries could safely dispute. He invested the Norman Richard in the principality of Capua; Robert Guiscard in the Dukedom of Apulia, of Calabria, and of Sicily, which he was to recover from the Saracens.

The Sovereign was not long in putting his feudatories to the test of their fidelity. The Pope returned to Rome, followed by his new Prætorian guards. Their first duty, which they undertook with fierce delight, was the extermination, or at least the humiliation of

¹ "Hic ecclesiastica propter
Ad partes illas tractanda negotia venit.
Namque sacerdotes, Levitæ, clericus omnis
Hæc regione palam se conjugio sociabant.
Concilium celebrans ibi Papa faventibus illi
Præsulibus centum jus ad synodale vocatis,
Ferre sacerdotes monet altarisque ministros
Arma pudicitie : vocat hos et præcipit esse
Ecclesie sponso, quia non est jure sacerdos
Luxurie cultor; sic extirpavit ab illis
Partibus uxores omnino Presbyterorum
Spretiores minitans anathemate percutiendos."

Gul. App., lib. ii. ; *Muratori*, v. 202.

The clergy of the kingdom of Naples, like that of the rest of Italy, were to a great extent married: they were Greeks in this usage, as in subjection to the empire; but Nicolas and the Normans were leagued to extirpate all Greek influences.

those ruthless nobles who had so long ruled over Rome. They trampled on the pride of the Counts of Tusculum, Præneste, and Nomentana,¹ who looked out from their inaccessible castles to see their territories wasted with fire and sword; and were even driven to go to Rome and make their peace with the Pope. The Normans crossed the Tiber, attacked the Count of Galeria, whose castle commanded the road to Rome, and who plundered all the pilgrims on their way. This ruffian had been vainly anathematized by each succeeding Pope, the last time in full synod by Nicolas himself, for robbing an English archbishop (Stigand of Canterbury) and an English Count of 1000 pounds.² This castle and others as far as Sutri, they demolished or subdued.

The proceedings of Nicolas II., this absolute Italianization of the Pope, this close alliance with the only race who could confront the military prowess of the Germans, were watched with the utmost jealousy by the Imperialists in Italy, and by the whole of Germany. At Florence Nicolas felt the approach of death; he began to take measures for the appointment of his successor. It was his manifest aim absolutely to exclude the Germans from all hope, from all concern in this splendid inheritance. Already the great German prelates had observed, that all which the Lateran Council had left to the Emperor had been the supercilious notification by the Cardinals of the appointment to the Papacy, or if this statute might bear a stronger inter-

¹ "Nam non solum Tusculanorum, et Prænestinorum et Nomentanorum superbiam calcaverunt, sed et Romam transeuntes, Galeriam et omnia castra Comitum Gerardi, usque Sutrium vastaverant, quæ res Romanam urbem Capitaneorum liberavit dominatione." — Bonizo, p. 806.

² *Money of Pavia*, says the *Disceptatio Synodalis*, p. 1169.

pretation, Pope Nicolas is said to have issued a second decree almost annulling the consent of the Emperor. Hanno of Cologne, who had already been involved in some dispute with Pope Nicolas, with the consent of the other great prelates of Germany, took up the cause of July 27, 1061. the Emperor, which was now that of the Transalpine Church; he sent letters of excommunication, of deposition from the Papal throne to the dying Nicolas. Nicolas is said to have read them with deep affliction, and immediately to have expired.¹

The Cardinals on the death of Nicolas still held together, yet they did not venture at once to act upon the Lateran decrees or that of the deceased Pope. They feared, or were too prudent to defy the whole German interest. The Counts of Tusculum and the other barons, in revenge for their humiliation, threw themselves headlong into the Imperial faction. They sent the golden crown and the other insignia of the Patriarchate to the young Henry, and urged him to nominate a Pope, not a Roman. It might be seen at once at whom was pointed their sentence of exclusion. The Cardinals likewise sent a Legate, the Cardinal Stephen, to the youthful King and to his mother. This Cardi-

¹ "Ad vindicandam vero suam aliorumque injuriam erexit se animo Coloniensis. . . . Communi consensu orthodoxorum episcoporum, direxit illis (the Pope and the Cardinals) excommunicationis epistolam, quâ visâ et dolens, et gemens præsentem (the Pope) deseruit vitam." This passage of Benzo (lib. vii. p. 397) is partly confirmed by a passage from Anselm of Lucca (or Cardinal Deusdedit), who asserts that the Emperor and the Germans had made themselves unworthy even of this scanty mark of respect, the notification of the appointment of the Pope: *Primum quia postea Nicolaum Coloniensem Archiepiscopum pro suis excessibus corripuisse graviter tulerunt, cumque hujus gratiâ, quantum in se erat, a Papatu deposuerunt, et nomen ejusdem in canone consecrationis nominari vetuerunt.* *Ap. Canis. Antiq. Lect. vi. p. 221. Compare Höfler, p. 358.*

nal was not admitted, probably as representing a body who were usurping the rights of the Empire.

Hildebrand knew that his time was not yet come; and of all the great qualifications of this lofty Churchman, nothing is more extraordinary than his suppression of his personal ambition, the patience with which he was content to work in a subordinate station, to be the first in influence without being the first in worldly dignity. Nor was there any other ecclesiastic in the Church of Rome whom he dared or chose to advance. The vacancy continued for three months, even before the initiatory nomination of the Cardinals took place. At length they chose a Lombard, Anselm of Badagio, Bishop of Lucca; but a Lombard with peculiar claims and marked opinions, who brought with him a strong and now triumphant party in Northern Italy; who was the sworn and tried enemy of doctrines odious to a large part, especially odious to the whole monastic section of the Church. Anselm had at one time been proposed as Archbishop of Milan: had he obtained that rank, the feud which was kept alive by the weakness, the connivance, if not the inclination of that great prelate towards the married clergy, had come to an earlier issue.

The Archbishop of Milan was the most powerful prince, when there was not an Italian Emperor or King of Italy, in the north of the Peninsula. The power of the Archbishop, and the use which he could make of this power, cannot be estimated without ascending to the beginning of this century, and even higher than the archiepiscopate of Heribert. Milan owes almost all her glory to her Archbishops. The first restorer Anspert archbishop, 863; died 881. of her greatness was Archbishop Anspert. Milan, which had ranked among the nine great cities

of the Empire, whose wonders had been commemorated in the poetical panegyric of Ausonius,¹ had never recovered its utter ruin by Attila. Pavia, under the Ostrogoths and Lombards, was the capital of Northern Italy. The great Archbishop Anspert (during the reign of Charles the Fat) first assumed his metropolitan dignity over his suffragans of Cremona and Bergamo, haughtily neglected the citations of the Pope; and when John VIII. commanded the clergy of Milan to proceed to a new election in place of the contumacious prelate, the clergy paid no regard whatever to the mandate. Anspert was a magnificent as well as powerful prelate; he built the porch of San Ambrogio. Heribert, who now stands before us, was the second founder of Milan's greatness. The Archbishop Otto of Visconti (in later times) was the first Lord of Milan, and handed down the ducal dominion (a more dubious title to the gratitude of Milan!) to the house of Visconti.² The prelate-prince Heribert was magnificent in his charities and uncompromising in his assertion of his episcopal rights. During a long famine, more or less severe, of twenty years, his prodigality to the poor was unexhausted; at the same time he seized with a strong hand all the property of the Church which had been wasted or alienated by the rapacity or weakness of his predecessors. He was esteemed a great divine, but not less a master in worldly policy.³ One of his first acts was to cross the Alps,⁴ and of his sole authority to elect Conrad the Salic King of Italy. According to the right

Archbishop
Heribert,
1018.

¹ "Et Mediolani mira omnia." The verses are worth reading. — Auson

² Landulph. Sen. ii.

³ "Divinâ pollens scientiâ, sæcularique ingenio astutus."

⁴ Verri, Storia di Milano, c. ii. p. 87.

asserted by the Archbishop of Milan to crown the King of Italy (that of crowning the Emperor belonged to the Pope) Conrad received the famous iron crown from the hand of Heribert;¹ and at the diet of Roncaglia, Italy recognized the sovereign thus chosen by the Archbishop of Milan.² When Conrad went to Rome to receive the Imperial crown, there A.D. 1026. broke out one of the fierce quarrels for precedence between the Archbishops of Milan and Ravenna. It was suspended for a time by the Pope's authority, but followed by a war in which the two martial prelates of the same name headed their own forces. Heribert of Ravenna escaped with difficulty within the walls of his city. Among the rewards for his service the Emperor Conrad had bestowed on the Archbishops of Milan the right to appoint, or at least to grant the investiture of the See of Lodi. On the death of the bishop, Heribert hastened to supply the place with a faithful partisan. The clergy and people of Lodi resented this invasion of their rights, and proceeded to another election. Heribert instantly marched upon Lodi; after a vigorous resistance he compelled the city to receive his bishop, and from this cause sprang the implacable hatred between Milan and Lodi.³ The martial prelate, also in obedience to the summons of his liege lord, crossed the Alps, and aided Conrad in the conquest of Burgundy. But his own warlike nobles began to

¹ Arnulfus, *Rer. Ital. Script.*, ix. 14; Wippo, *Vit. Conrad.*.

² "Nel corso di ventisette anni ch' egli occupò questa sede, Milano diventò la città precipua della Lombardia." — Verri, p. 124.

³ "Ab illo etenim tempore inter Mediolanenses et Laudenses implacabile viguit odium." The Milanese were the more powerful and wealthy: those of Lodi valiant to ferocity (truces). They cared not for loss, if they could inflict loss on their enemies. — Arnulf, ii. c. vii.

rebel against the tyranny of Heribert. The important law of Conrad, passed at the Diet of Roncaglia, had wrought a revolution in the feudal system; it recognized the hereditary descent of fiefs hitherto, nominally at least, held at the will of the suzerain. Heribert refused to admit the valvassors of the Church of Milan to this privilege; he seized on a vacant fief, and thus embodied against him all the great beneficiaries. They broke out in open rebellion.¹ Heribert attempted to allay the mutiny by prudent measures; he then had recourse to force. With the assistance, no doubt, of the people, to whom the tyrannous nobles were odious, he drove them out of the city. They left it in sorrow.² There, however, they were joined by the lords of the surrounding castles and by the people of Lodi, burning for revenge against Heribert. A great battle took place at Campo Malo; the Bishop of Asti, on Heribert's side, was slain. Heribert, confounded by many desertions, retired into the city, and summoned the Emperor to his aid.³

Conrad crossed the Alps, but instead of espousing the
A.D. 1037. cause of the Archbishop, offended by the freedom of the populace, he retired to hold his court at Pavia. There, at a great diet, he sat as suzerain, to grant redress to all appellants to his tribunal. A charge was brought against the Archbishop of Milan; it was seconded by clamorous outcries from his enemies. The Emperor commanded the arrest of the Archbishop of Milan, and his partisans the Bishops of Vercelli, Piacenza, and Cremona. The intelligence was received

¹ This, I think, is clear from Arnulf; "*Comperitâ autem occasione cujusdam beneficio privati, subito prouunt.*" — Ibid.

² "*Ab urbe discedunt mœrentes.*" — Ibid.

³ Arnulf, ii.; Landulf, ii. 22.

with profound sorrow and indignation at Milan. The clergy chanted solemn litanies for his deliverance, the people rushed to arms. Heribert contrived to escape from his drunken German guards, and threw himself into the city, where he was received with universal joy. The Emperor speedily laid siege to Milan; the Archbishop made a gallant defence, and Conrad retired discomfited. In revenge he declared Heribert deposed, and appointed a rival prelate. The dauntless Heribert retaliated by secretly endeavoring to set up a rival King of Italy. Insulted and baffled, after having ravaged the whole country in his impotent wrath, the mighty Emperor Conrad retired beyond the Alps.¹ The triumphant Heribert wreaked his ^{Aug.} _{A.D. 1038.} vengeance on the adherents of the rival prelate, punishing them in person and in property.

Thus the conqueror at once of his own rebellious liegemen and of the Emperor himself, the Archbishop ruled his splendid city, which he seemed determined to arm against any future aggressions upon its liberties.² It was at this time that the Christian bishop invented the carroccio, the car-borne standard of Milan, afterwards adopted by the other Italian cities. In the great car rose a tall mast with a transverse beam, supporting a banner, on which above were the arms of the city, below the crucified Saviour, visible to the whole army, to animate or console the combatants in success or defeat. The elevation of this banner was the summons

¹ Conrad, who had proceeded to the south of Italy, obtained the excommunication of the Archbishop of Milan from Pope Benedict XI. Heribert paid no more respect to the excommunication of the Pope than to the ban of the empire. Conrad died the year after, June 4. A.D. 1039.

² Landolph is throughout the wondering panegyrist of Heribert.

which all Milan was to obey, the peasant and the noble, the rich and the poor.¹

Milan, but for her internal dissensions, now relieved by the death of Conrad from her one formidable enemy, might have enjoyed long prosperity. For a time Heribert overawed both nobles and people. But other feuds began. The new military captains trained by Heribert in his wars had proved more intolerable tyrants than the old nobles, whom the people began to regret, and to call the guardians and protectors rather than the oppressors of the people.² Yet we find the whole nobility soon united in a common cause. Lanzo, one of the nobles, espoused the popular faction. The valvasors and the populace met in bloody strife in every quarter of the city. Again the worsted nobles were forced to leave the city; again the country chieftains made common cause with them. Six fortresses were built to bar every access to the city; for three years Milan was in a state of siege.³ But the skill and courage of Lanzo baffled all assault. The city suffered greatly from famine. A small domain under the walls produced some corn and wine. On both sides the prisoners were treated with the utmost inhumanity. The part which Heribert took in this conflict is not clear. By some he is represented as having left the city with the expelled nobles. His panegyrist ascribes to him a stately neutrality.⁴ Though connected with them by birth, he rebuked, with vain but earnest severity, the

¹ Compare Verri, p. 133; Muratori, Dissert.; Arnulf, ii. 16.

² Landulph panegyryzes the ancient "Duces."

³ The beginning of this feud was A.D. 1051 or 1052.

⁴ "Qualiter nec fuit cum populo, nec voluntati majorum juvit." — Landulph.

avarice and licentiousness of the nobles, yet would not commit himself to the popular cause.

Lanzo at length found his way to the Court of Henry, the son and successor of the Emperor Conrad. But Henry suspected the fickleness of the Italians; he dreaded the enmity of Heribert, so fatal to his father. He imposed the hard terms, that four thousand of his cavalry should be admitted within the city, and that Lanzo should be answerable for the fidelity of the citizens. Lanzo was a man of inexhaustible resources. With patriotic treachery he revealed his own secret negotiations with the Emperor, and used these haughty demands as an argument to force the conflicting parties to peace. He urged on the nobles and people that their quarrels would only yield them up to the remorseless tyranny of the barbarous Germans. The nobles reëntered the city; peace was restored.

Soon after this Heribert died. The Archbishop consoled his weeping attendants on his deathbed — “I am going to the feet of St. Ambrose.” He received the Sacrament in the presence of the whole clergy of Milan; and this martial and secular prelate was, if not directly canonized by the admiration of his countrymen, yet admitted to equal veneration with the holiest and most world-despising saints. His miracles were soon recorded in the chronicles of the city. The worthy successor of St. Ambrose was reported to have averted famine from the land by his prayers. The pastoral staff of Ambrose, having been stolen by a sacrilegious robber for the sake of its precious metal, revealed itself to his successor.

Who was to fill the throne of the mighty and sainted Heribert? Among the names proposed was that of

Anselm of Badagio, afterwards Bishop of Lucca, and Pope under the name of Alexander II.¹ The choice fell upon Guido, a man of far inferior character and determination than his predecessor,² whose warlike example he seemed at first disposed to follow, he headed the troops of Milan in a war with Pavia; he asserted at Rome the precedency of the Milanese see against rival Ravenna. But Guido was unequal to the imminent crisis, more important to the Church and to Christianity than all the disputes between the nobles, valvassors, and people, when the clergy of Milan dared to assert their real or supposed privileges against all the power of Rome, against the reviving austerity of monasticism, and against the populace of Milan. It involved the great question of the marriage of the priesthood, of which the Milanese clergy were the avowed champions. It was a protest, or rather a direct rebellion against the vast scheme of ecclesiastical dominion already matured, at least in the mind of Hildebrand; and which could never have been accomplished but by a celibate clergy. Anselm of Badagio, an avowed monk, a monk of monks, as Archbishop of Milan, would have taken a decided part; Guido, by his vacillation, incurred the contempt of both parties, inflaming the feud by his unsettled policy, and betraying, from want of courage to support it, that cause to which no doubt he had a secret leaning.

The Church of Milan revered the memory of St. Ambrose. Ambrose almost as proudly as Rome that of

¹ The four candidates were presented to the Emperor Henry. Guido was not a noble. — Giulini, iii. p. 422.

² “Vi volle tutta l’astuzia di Guido, tutto il timore, che si aveva del re Enrico e multo denaro, per ottenere, che fosse consecrato il nuovo archivescovo.” — Verri, p. 136.

St. Peter. Milan boasted the most numerous, best appointed and best organized clergy. According to a proverb of the time, Milan was to be admired for its clergy, Pavia for its pleasures, Rome for its buildings, Ravenna for its churches.¹ It had its peculiar service, the Ambrosian, which had been respected, and was undisturbed by Gregory the Great.

But the Church of Milan possessed likewise — or boasted that it possessed — an unbroken tradition from St. Ambrose himself. They cited ^{Church of Milan asserts right of marriage.} boldly, publicly, and without any charge that they had falsified the text — the very words of St. Ambrose, authorizing, if not the marriage of the clergy, the Greek usage, that priests married before their ordination should retain their wives.² Heribert

¹ "Ecclesia enim Ambrosiana Domino annuente, sapientibus sacerdotibus Levitis et Subdiaconibus, super ceteras abundabat ecclesias. Unde in proverbium dictum est, Mediolanum in clericis, Pavia in deliciis, Roma in aedificiis, Ravenna in ecclesiis." — Landulph, Sen. iii. p. 96. Damiani himself praises highly the clergy of Turin (alled with Milan) as in all other respects virtuous, learned. "They chanted like angels; they seemed a noble ecclesiastical senate." When he found them married, all their virtues disappeared. — *Opuscul. xviii.*

² This was the sentence: "*De monogamiâ sacerdotum quid loquar? quum una tantum permittitur copula et non repetita, et hæc lex est non iterare conjugium.*" This text now stands: "*De castimoniâ autem quid loquar, quando una tantum nec repetita permittitur copula? Et in ipso ergo conjugio lex est non iterare conjugium.*" — S. Ambros. *Oper. edit. St. Maur. ii. 66, Paris, 1686.* Another passage was triumphantly cited in a public speech (*Rer. Ital. Script. iv. p. 109*): "*Virtutum autem magister apostolus est . . . qui unus uxoris virum præcipit esse, non quod exortem excludat conjugii, nam hoc supra legem præcepti est, sed ut conjugali castimoniâ fruatur absolutionis sui gratiâ: nulla enim culpa est conjugii, sed lex.* Ideo apostolus legem posuit dicens: si quis sine crimine est, unus uxoris vir, tenetur ad legem *sacerdotii supradicti* (am?) qui autem iteraverit conjugium, culpam quidem non habet coinquinati, sed prærogativâ exiit *sacerdotis.*" In the editions this now stands: "*Ut conjugali castimoniâ servet absolutionis sui gratiam.*" Instead of the words in italics, omitted: "*Neque iterum ut filios in sacerdotio creare apostolica invitetur auctoritate, habentem enim dixit filios non facientem, neque conjugium iterare.*" Then:

himself, the great Archbishop, was a married man; his wedlock had neither diminished his power nor barred his canonization.¹ In assertion of this privilege they dauntlessly defied all superior authority, denied as to this, as to their other precious rights, all supremacy of the Pope. Nor was it a privilege of which they availed themselves sparingly. By the accounts of friends and foes, the practice of marriage was all but universal among the Lombard clergy. They were publicly, legally, married with ring and dowry,² as were the laity of Milan; and

"Ideo apostolus legem posuit dicens, si quis sine crimine est unius uxoris vir, tenetur ad legem sacerdotii suscipiendi," *et seqq.*

At the revival of letters there were great disputes about the falsification of the texts of the Fathers. See Koster's Preface to Edit. Basil. 1555; Francis Junius, Præfat. ad Indic. Expurgat.; Rivet, Critica Sacra, iii. 6; Daillé: on the other side, the Benedictine Editors and Puricelli, apud Muratori, R. It. Scrip.; and the Preface of Cardinal Montalto to the Roman edition. Sound and impartial criticism would, in my judgment, unquestionably maintain the older reading. Yet forgeries were clearly not all on one side. Galvaneo Fiamma quotes from an ancient chronicle of Dazio the account of a synod held at Constantinople (an apocryphal synod), in which Ambrose was present! in which one party asserted that married priests could not be saved. The supreme pontiff (Damasus!) submitted the question to S. Ambrose. He replied: "Perfectio vitæ non in castitate, sed in charitate consistit, secundum illud Apostoli, si linguis hominum loquor et angelorum, etc. Ideo lex concedit sacerdotes semel virginem uxorem ducere, sed conjugium non iterare. Si autem mortuâ primâ uxore sacerdos aliam duxerit, sacerdotium amittat." Peter Azerid wrote thus at the beginning of the fourteenth century: "Iis omnino benedicens B. Ambrosius, unâ uxore uti posse concessit, quâ defunctâ, et ipsi vidui in æternum permaneant. Quæ consuetudo duravit annis septuaginta usque ad tempora Alexandri Papæ, quæ civitas Mediolanensis genuerat." In the older editions of Corio (*minea* is Venezia, 1554) is a passage which was struck out in the later editions: "Concesse loro (S. Ambrogio) ch'è potessero havere moglie vergire la qual morendo, restassero poi vedove, sì come chiaramente si legge nella prima al Timoteo." — p. 56. Puricelli in Muratori, H. I. S. iv. 122.

¹ "Hic Archiepiscopus habuit uxorem nobilem mulierem: quæ donavit totam suam monasterio Sancti Dionysii, quæ usque hodiè Uxeria dicitur." — Galvaneus Fiamma, *sub ann.* 1040.

² "Cuncti enim cum publicis uxoribus sive scortis suam in nomine du-

this, which was elsewhere esteemed a vice, became in Milan, by their bold assertion of its lawfulness, a heresy.¹

Still there were many of the austerer clergy in Milan, as in other parts of Italy, who looked with what they esteemed righteous indignation at this licentious and sensual privilege. Three persons bound themselves in a holy league of enmity against the married clergy: of these Anselm of Badagio was one; the second, Ariald, a man of humble birth, and therefore more able to speak to the hearts of the rude populace; the third, Landulph, a noble, remarkable for his eloquence. Landulph and Ariald began to preach in Milan to the populace of the city, and to the peasantry, the unlawfulness and licentiousness of a married clergy.² Each party strove to implicate the other with the name of an odious heresy; the monastics branded the asserters of clerical marriage with the old name proverbial for sensuality, Nicolaitans: the Lombard Clergy affected to treat their adversaries as Paterines or Manicheans. This was no unmeaning phrase. During the rule of Heribert, one of those strange sects, with many old Gnostic opinions,

cebant vitam." — Vit. B. Arialdi, a B. Andrea, Bolland, xxvii. Jun. In the first sermon of Ariald, he says of the clergy: "*Et ipsi, ut cernitis, sicut laici palam uxores ducunt.*" He adds; "*Stuprum quemadmodum scelesti laici sequuntur.*" — Ibid. He speaks of their greater vigor as not laboring but living "*ex dono Dei.*"

¹ "*Vitium quippe in heresin vertitur, cum perversi dogmatis assertionem firmatur.*" See the furious invective of Damiani "*contra clericos intemperantes,*" c. vii. "*Nec vos terreat — (he is urging the pellices, as he calls them, to break off their connexions) — quod forte, non dicam fidei, sed perfidiæ vos annulus subarrhavit; quod rata et monimenta dotalia notarius quasi matrimonii jure conscripsit: quod juramentum ad confirmandam quodammodo conjugii copulam utrinque processit. Ignorantes quia pro uniuscujusque fugaci voluptate concubitus mille annorum negotiantur invendum.*" — Ibid. c. iii.

² The Council of Pavia, under Benedict VIII. (A.C. 1021), with the approbation of the emperor, Henry II., had passed an ordinance to enforce the celibacy of the clergy.

had appeared at Monteforte. A certain Gerard was at their head: their doctrines contained much of mystic Gnosticism. They identified the Saviour with the soul of man born into a corruptible state.¹ The Holy Ghost was apparently the divine Intelligence (Nous) revealing itself to man. They were severe ascetics, condemned all union of the sexes, and said that if men would abstain from corruption, they would generate like bees, without conjunction. They denied the absolving power of the priesthood, that they ascribed to an unseen influence which visited God's people. Their great tenet was that it was right to die in torments, so to purify the soul; they rejoiced therefore in martyrdom: if not so happy as to meet it before the approach of death, they were released by one of their own people. Heribert gratified their passion for martyrdom; he burned all, except a few, who shrunk from death, on an immense pyre in Milan.² The married clergy taunted their opponents with the name and tenets of this hated sect; they even lodged a formal accusation against them before the archbishop. Guido attempted to silence both parties by gentle admonitions, but without effect; at length the conflict broke out.

During a great festival, for the translation of the reliques of the martyr Nazarius, a priest was maddened by the unmeasured invectives of Ariald against his married brethren. Ariald had driven the singers and all the clergy out of the choir of the church; he caused a paper to be written, which bound all the clergy under an oath to maintain their chastity; he endeavored to compel all ecclesiastics to sign this paper.³ The priest

¹ Rodolphus Glaber, iv. 2; Landulph, Sen.

² Landulph, apud Muratori.

³ Arnulf.

broke out into a violent harangue, and struck Ariald. This was the signal for a general tumult; the adherents of Ariald rushed through the streets, the bells rang, the populace gathered from all quarters. The populace are usually on the side of those who make the most austere show of religion; they were jealous of the wealth of the clergy: many of them, like the plebeians of Rome, were burdened with heavy debts, severely exacted no doubt by the clergy.¹ The higher ecclesiastics were mostly patrician in birth, and habits, and faction. Everywhere they were insulted, assaulted, beaten, their houses plundered; and they were forced by a summary process of divorce to abandon their wives.² The nobles were overawed and dared not interpose. Nor were the clergy of the city alone exposed to this popular persecution. The preachers roved through the country and stirred up the peasantry against the priests and their concubines, — they would give them no more respectful name.

Ariald and Landulph went to Rome, to obtain the sanction of the Pope, Stephen IX., for their proceedings. The Cardinal Dionysius, a Milanese by birth, attempted a cautious and timid opposition; he did not venture, except slightly and incidentally, to enter on the grave question of the marriage of the clergy; but remonstrated against the violence of their adversaries, the stirring up the rabble with clubs, and spears, and swords, against the holy anointed priesthood. A Legation was appointed by Pope Stephen, consisting of

¹ "Horum disseminatis verbis pestilenter, subito multi quibus alienum æs purissime exigebatur, quosque foris et intus dura paupertas agebat," etc. — Landulph, vi. 9.

² "Postea vero summo cum dedecore mulierum divortium sine lege, sine jure, sine Episcopo, non Deum, sed pecuniam illorum amantes, gladiis et fustibus feriebant." — Ibid.

Ariald, Anselm of Lucca, and Hildebrand. This first mission had no effect in allaying the strife; the dissension was growing fast into a civil war.¹

Guido at length took courage, and assembling a synod A.D. 1058. at Novara, or rather at Fontaneto, in the territory of Novara, asserted his full archiepiscopal authority,² and excommunicated the turbulent Ariald, Landulph, and their partisans; they treated the excommunication with contempt. Another Legation arrived, with the famous Peter Damiani, now compelled to be a cardinal, who, with Anselm of Lucca, was commissioned by the new Pope, Nicolas, to investigate the spiritual state of Milan. Peter Damiani was the austere monk in Italy, a monk who, compelled to be a bishop, had striven with all his might to throw off the worldly and unholy burden. His horror at sexual indulgence was almost a madness.³ Yet the Cardinal and his A.D. 1059. colleagues were received with all outward show of respect by the Archbishop and the clergy; but the pride of the Milanese of all ranks was in secret skilfully excited; would they permit the church of St. Ambrose to be enslaved by that of Rome? The popular indig-

¹ This first legation is distinctly asserted by Landulph; it is barely possible that it may be another version of the later one.

² "Ut quodammodo Ecclesia Mediolanensis suis jussibus obtemperaret."

³ "Interea et vos alloquor, o lepores clericorum, pulpamenta diaboli, projectio Paradisi, virus mentium, gladii animarum, aconita bibentium, toxica convivarum, materia peccandi, occasio pereundi. Vos, inquam, alloquor, gynecæa hostis antiqui, vos upupæ, ululæ, noctuæ, lupæ, sanguisugæ, affer, affer sine cessatione dicentes. Venite itaque audite me, scorta, prostibula, savia, volutabra porcorum pinguium, cubilia spirituum immundorum, nymphæ, sirenæ, lamiæ, *dianæ*, quæ? . . . vos tigrides impiæ . . . vos harpyæ, vos sirenæ atque charybides . . . vos viperæ furiosæ," — and so on for paragraphs. These are the terms in which he addresses the wives of the clergy. Damiani must be read to understand his sacred horror of priestly wedlock.

nation was further roused by the appearance of the Legate with Anselm of Lucca on his right hand, and the archbishop of Milan on his left. Milan assembled at the ringing of the bells in all the churches, and the summons of an enormous brazen trumpet, which shrieked through the streets. The fickle populace were now as furious in defence of the clergy, who seemed the champions of the liberties of the city, as they had been in their persecution. The cry was loud that the church of S. Ambrose would never submit to the Roman pontiff. The life of Damiani was in danger;¹ but Damiani was not a man to quail before popular tumult; he mounted the pulpit; he asserted with firm and argumentative tone the supreme jurisdiction of Rome;² he boldly appealed to their own archives to prove that Ambrose himself had applied to the Pope Siricius, and that the Pope had sent his legates, a priest, a deacon, and a subdeacon, to assist Ambrose in rooting out from his city that same Nicolaitan heresy, the marriage of the clergy, for which they now asserted the authority of Ambrose.³ Guido was grown older and more timid; the people saw him seated of his own ac-

¹ "Intentabant mihi, ut ita loquor, omnem mentem, et, ut ab amicis meis sæpe suggestum est, nonnulli meum sanguinem sitiabant." — Damian. Op. v.

² Damiani (ad Card. Hildebrand) describes the sensitive pride of the Milanese as to the Church of St. Ambrose: "Factione clericorum repente in populo murmur exoritur non debere Ambrosianam ecclesiam Romanis legibus subicere, nullumque judicandi vel disponendi jus Romano pontifici in illâ sede competere. Nimis indignum, inquam, ut quæ sub progenitoribus nostris semper fuit libera ad nostræ confusionis opprobrium nunc alteri, quod absit, ecclesiæ sit subjecta!"

³ Damiani probably believed this dauntless assertion. Siricius was certainly the first Pope who authoritatively condemned the marriage of the clergy; but imagine Ambrose needing or demanding aid from the Pope to exterminate this heresy in his own diocese!

cord on a stool at the feet of Damiani. The clergy, deserted by the bishops, deserted again by the populace, who were overawed by the eloquence and lofty bearing of the cardinal, had no resource but humble submission.¹ The Archbishop, reluctantly, it is said, took a solemn oath against simony, and against the marriage of priests. The clergy were compelled to subscribe the humiliating concession ; every simoniac (and of simony every clergyman of Milan, from the Archbishop downwards, was accused) was to submit to a penance of five or seven years in proportion to his guilt ; but there were those who felt the pride of Milan humbled, Damiani's assuming precedence over the archbishop goaded them to frenzy. " O senseless Milanese ! (writes the indignant historian, who represents the feelings of this party) who has fascinated you ? Yesterday you clamored for the independent supremacy of your see, to-day you submit to this base subjection. If Rome is to be honored for the apostle, Milan is not to be despised, who boasts her Ambrose." ²

At the great Council, however, at Rome (1059), which assigned the election of the Popes to the cardinals, Guido sat, as archbishop of Milan, at the right hand of the Pope, a reward for his submission. He was attended by his suffragans, the Bishops of Brescia, Turin, Asti, Novara, Lodi, Vercelli. Ariald assailed Guido, as a favorer of simony and of concubinage ; he was defended by his suffragans ; the temper of Nicolas allayed the strife. Guido perhaps hence was again

¹ Damiani's letter to Guido, humbly thanking him for the gift of two stoles, contrasts singularly with his demeanor and influence in the city.—*Epist.* iii. 7.

² Arnulph. Compare Tristano Calchi, *Hist. Patr.* vi. 132.

supposed to espouse the cause of the married clergy; he rose, therefore, with them into high popularity. Though the Council denounced both simony and concubinage in severe statutes, the Lombard bishops dared not publish them in their cities. Adrian of Brescia alone ventured to do this: he hardly escaped being torn to pieces by the rabble. In Cremona and Piacenza the people split into two parties — those who adhered to, and those who refused communion with the married clergy.¹

Anselm of Badagio, Bishop of Lucca, the instigator of Landulph and of Ariald, was now summoned to a loftier station: on him had fallen the choice of the cardinals assembled at Rome. But the election of Alexander II. (such was his title) without the consent of the Emperor, was received as a bold invasion of the Imperial rights by the Transalpine prelates. The Lombard ecclesiastics, especially those who were for the marriage of the clergy, dreaded the elevation of Alexander, whom they hated with personal hatred, and foresaw no doubt the overweening influence of Hildebrand and of the high monastic party. They too would have an Italian Pope, but a Pope from their part of Italy.²

Guibert was the Chancellor of the Empire, the administrator of the Imperial interests in Italy. By his

¹ "Concilio igitur rite celebrato episcopi Longobardi donum rementes, cum magnas *Levitis concubinariis et sacerdotibus accepissent pecunias* [Bonizo was on the other side] *decreta Patrum celaverunt prætur unum scilicet Brixiensium Episcopum qui veniens Brixiam, cum decreta Papæ publice recitasset, a clericis verberatus pæne occisus est, quod factum non medioere Patentiæ dedit incrementum. Nam non solum Brixia, sed et Cremonæ et Placentiæ et per omnes alias provincias multi concubinatorum abstinebant communione.*" — Bonizo, p. 807.

² "Nec aliunde se habere Papam, nisi ex Paradiso Italiæ, talemque qui scivit compati infirmitatibus eorum." — Bonizo, p. 80.

advice a Council was assembled in Basle, composed of German and Lombard prelates. The Council annulled the election of Alexander, and chose Cadalous, Bishop of Parma, who took the name of Honorius II.¹ The Roman people were represented at Basle by the Count of Galeria, and some of the other barons who had been put down by the Normans. The passions of the time can be best known by the language of the time. It would be unjust to estimate the character of Cadalous by the frantic words of Damiani; but they show clearly the fanaticism of hatred with which his appointment was viewed by the adverse party. He is described as the preacher of the devil, the enemy of man's salvation, the apostle of Antichrist, the gulf of lewdness, the filth of mankind, the sink of all vices, the abomination of heaven, food for hell fire.² After these and many other equally opprobrious terms, it is nothing to accuse him of the most deplorable ignorance.³ Unfortunately Dami-

¹ Compare throughout the *Disceptatio Synodalis* between the advocate of the Emperor and the Defender of the Roman Church before the Council of Augsburg, remembering that it was the work of Peter Damiani. I had written Osbor after the authorities. The Germans, as I am informed by M. Ranke, know no such place: they read Augsburg. [1857.]

² "Cadalous videlicet perturbator ecclesiæ, eversor Apostolicæ disciplinæ, inimicus salutis humanæ . . . radix peccati, præco Diaboli, apostolus Antichristi; et quid plura dicam? sagitta producta de pharetrâ Satanæ, virga Assur, filius Belial, filius perditionis, qui adversatur et extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus, aut quod colitur: vorago libidinis, naufragium castitatis, Christianitatis opprobrium, ignominia sacerdotum, genimen viperarum, fœtor orbis, spurcitia sæculi, dedecus universitatis . . . serpens lubricus, coluber tortuosus, stercus hominum, latrina criminum, sentina vitiorum, abominatio cœli, projectio paradisi, pabulum Tartari, stipula ignis æterni." — Damiani, *Epist.* vii. 3. The whole epistle is to obtain the interposition of the youthful Emperor.

³ Damiani, writing to the Archbishop of Ravenna, who seems to have doubted which side to take, represents Cadalous as without character or learning: "Ita est homo stolidus et nullius ingenii ut credi possit nesciisse per se tallia machinari." — If he can explain a single verse, I will not say

ani assumed the language of a prophet, and foretold that the impious usurper would not live a year from the period of his elevation!¹ At the election of Cadalous, writes another hostile historian, the Simoniacs rejoiced, the priests who had concubines exulted with loud joy.² His partisans declared that all the Catholic Bishops of Italy, Germany, and Burgundy, approved his elevation.³

The election of Alexander had taken place on the 1st of October, that of Honorius II. on the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude (Oct 28). Open war must decide the contest for the vicegerency of the Prince of Peace. It was a war of Germany and the antimonastic part of the clergy in Lombardy and other parts of Italy on one side, against the Hildebrandism of Rome and the monasticism of Christendom aided by the arms of the Normans. Winter alone suspended the hostile operations; the passes of the Alps were closed. With the spring, Cadalous descended upon Italy; he was received with joyful acclamations, as the champion of their cause, by the Lombard prelates. But while he advanced, an unarmed conflict was taking place in Rome. Neither Pope nor Antipope was the most prominent man of his party. On the side of Cadalous (the Chancellor Guibert stood more aloof) was Benzo, Bishop of Albi, a faithful adherent of the Empire, but

of a psalm, but of a homily, I will at once submit to him, and own him not merely the successor of the Apostle, but an Apostle.

1 "Fumea vita volat, mors improvisa propinquat,
Imminet expleti præpes tibi terminus anni;
Non ego te fallo: cœpto morieris in anno."

Epist. i. 20.

2 "Tunc symoniaci lætabantur, concubinati vero sacerdotes ingenti exultabant tripudio." — Bonizo, p. 807.

3 "Collaudantibus Italiæ, Alemanniæ, Burgundiæ Catholicis Episcopis." — Benzo, c. iv.

a man of Italian subtlety, utterly unscrupulous, and of ready and popular eloquence, with that coarse saturnalian humor which pleases the Italian, especially the Roman ear.¹ Benzo appeared, and was received in Rome as the ambassador of the Emperor. He was lodged in the Octavian palace. During a whole week he was permitted to address the people day after day. Those whom he could not persuade with his eloquence he bribed with money, for from the private wealth of Cadalous, which was large, and other sources, he was richly provided with means of working on the Roman nobles and people.² In his harangues, he treated Alexander with the bitterest contempt, and openly strove to alienate the people from him; to Hildebrand he paid the homage of his most furious invective. Neither the Pope nor Hildebrand ventured to disturb this avowed emissary of Cadalous; he was also the representative of the Empire. At the end of the week a great meeting was held in the Hippodrome, and there Alexander determined to confront his adversary. He appeared on horseback, and was received with a doubtful murmur. Benzo rose, and in his character as ambassador, reproached him with ingratitude and rebellion against the Emperor, as having abandoned his See of Lucca and usurped that of Rome.³ "Thou hast ob-

¹ The strange, barbarous rhapsody, the panegyric of Benzo on Henry IV. written partly in verse, in jingling Leonine rhyme, partly in what may hardly be called prose, as a contemporary document is of considerable value. It was written avowedly to obtain preferment; its adulation therefore is even more worthless than that of ordinary panegyrics. But Benzo's account of the affairs in which he was personally engaged is too characteristic not to contain much truth.

² A large quantity of furs was among the presents: "*Clitellarios honustos preciosarum pellium donis.*" — Benzo, ii. c. 1.

³ The translation of bishops was still of doubtful legality, at least in many minds.

tained thy election to the popedom by the aid of Normans, robbers, and tyrants, and by notorious bribery. Hildebrand, that son of Simon Magus, was the chief agent in this detestable merchandise, for which ye have both incurred damnation before God and man." He accused Alexander of acts of cruelty and bloodshed, warned him to retire to Lucca, and after remaining there a month, to proceed to the court of the Emperor, there to undergo whatever penance might be imposed upon him. Alexander calmly answered, that he had received the Roman pontificate, but had not thereby broken his allegiance; that he would send his legate to the court of Henry to declare his will. He then turned his horse and rode off, amid the hootings of the populace — "Away, leper! out, wretch! begone, hateful one!"¹ On his return to the Octavian palace, Benzo assembled what he dignifies by the name of the Senate of Rome. He repeats a strange, coarse speech of Nicolas, the master of the palace, heaping the grossest insults on Hildebrand, and asserting that the election of the Pope must not be abandoned to monks and Normans. Benzo acknowledges the utter instability of the Roman populace, but dwells on the effect of his own eloquence, his lavish promises of mountains of gold,

¹ It is the boast of Benzo: —

"Bellum egi cum Prandello [Hildebrand] atque cum Badaculo [Anselm]
Qui thesaurum sancti Petri ponebant in sacco.
Eos expuli ex aræ, potitus primaculo."

He expects his reward: —

"Non est magnum tanto regi unum signum facere,
Hoc est dicere Benzoni, veni foras Lazare,
Redditâ tibi mercede, sta sub meo latere."

Lib. iv.

Benzo was a better partisan than poet.

and, if he be taken literally, the joys of Paradise.¹ By these means, and by skilful management of the leaders, he had organized a most powerful party.

Hildebrand, on the other hand, if he came less boldly forward, was neither irresolute nor inactive during this perilous crisis. Hildebrand is acknowledged, no less by the undisguised homage of his admirers than by the discerning hatred of his enemies, throughout the pontificate of Alexander, as something above the Pope. "You made him Pope," writes Damiani, in one of his moments of bitterness, "he made you a god." He was commonly called the Lord of the Lord Pope.² To him were attributed all the more vigorous and warlike measures of Alexander; ³ he held together the Romans of their faction; ⁴ and, according to his antagonist, lavished money with emulous prodigality.⁵ He was the impersonation, as it were, of monkhood.⁶

The Antipope in the mean time advanced with a large

¹ "Nunc pollicendo auri montes, nunc paradisi mellifluos fontes." — Benzo.

² The two well-known epigrams: —

"Papam rite colo, sed te prostratus adoro,
Tu facis hunc Dominum, te facit ille Deum."

"Vivere vis Romæ? clara depromite voce,
Plus Domino Papæ, quam Domno pareo Papæ."

³ "Magis solers vincere effuso mortalium sanguine, quam sacrorum canonum gloriosissimo certamine." — Benzo.

⁴ Hildebrand took counsel with Leo, a Jew by descent, with Cencius Frangipani, "et cum brachiato Johanne." Of the two former we shall hear more. The rest of his partisans were *beggars, who lived on the alms of the Church*. — Benzo.

⁵ Benzo says of his opponents that they put their trust not in the Lord, but "in multitudine divitiarum." Whence the wealth at the command of Hildebrand? From the monasteries? the Papal estates? the votive offerings of the faithful? the now religious Normans?

⁶ "Cotidie autem coram domino electi disputabant seniores, quomodo possint cuculati Dæmonis allidere tergiversationes." — Benzo, xi.

force and an ample treasure towards Rome. At Sutri he was met by Benzo, the Imperial ambassador, who had discharged his office of shaking the allegiance of the Romans, and forming a strong faction in the city. Honorius II. advanced towards Rome; the neighboring barons hailed their deliverer from the Pope and his Norman satellites. An embassy arrived from the Byzantine Emperor, or rather from the few Greeks who held their ground in Southern Italy, proposing a confederacy against the Normans. The Normans, partly, perhaps, preoccupied, or setting too high a value on their services, were unusually, suspiciously slow in their movements. The forces of Alexander ventured into the open field; they were defeated and driven within the walls.¹ Cadalous was not strong enough to force his way within the walls, but he crossed the Tiber to put himself in connection with the barons on that side of the city. He fixed his camp at Tusculum, where he received the Greek embassy. He was joined by the Count of Tusculum, the grandson of the famous Alberic.

Godfrey of Lorraine, the Duke of Tuscany, had learned caution by his eventful life: it had degenerated into craft. He aspired, no doubt Godfrey of Lorraine. with ulterior views, to hold the balance of power in Italy.² Hitherto he had declared for neither Pope.³

¹ There is a rapid but curious view of these affairs in the *Annales Romani*. — Pertz, v. 472.

² He was early an object of jealousy at the Imperial Court: "*Quo comperto imperator Henricus gravi scrupulo perurgeri cœpit, reputans ne forte per eum [Goffredum] animi Italorum, semper avidi novarum rerum, ut a regno Teutonicorum deficerent, sollicitarentur.*" — Lambert Hertzfeld, *sub an.* 1052.

³ See Damiani's Letters on the view of that part of Godfrey's character; his suspicious interview with Cadalous. — vii. 10, etc.

He had not interrupted the march of Cadalous along his frontier; he had allowed the attack on Rome. He was suspected of too friendly intercourse with Cadalous. Godfrey now appeared with an overpowering force; but, instead of joining either party, he assumed the lofty tone, not of a mediator, but an arbiter. He proposed that the two Popes should retire, each to his episcopal city, and there await the decision of the contest by the Emperor and the proper authorities. The haughty prelates were obliged to submit. Cadalous, having been first compelled by gentle, but irresistible violence, to surrender all his treasures to Godfrey, with-
A.D. 1062. drew to Parma. Alexander had no alternative but to receive the fair promises of friendship lavished upon him by the Tuscan, and in like manner retired to Lucca. The Church seemed to have surrendered herself by her unnatural quarrel to the superior secular power; Pope and Antipope waited their doom from the princes of the world.

A sudden revolution in Germany decided the contest for the Papacy. That revolution was accomplished by one of the powerful churchmen of the Rhine. It might seem only the daring effort of one bold man for ascendancy; but there are evident signs that if Hanno of Cologne was not supported by a widely organized conspiracy, which embraced the Hildebrandine party in Italy, he knew that he could reckon on their perfect sympathy. A young widow was the person least suited to govern the ambitious and mutually hostile feudatories of the empire, the almost independent princes and prelates, all aspiring to rule, none disposed to obey. She had power enough to give offence, none to control the refractory. Every grant

Revolution in
Germany.

or favor made many enemies — that of the fief of Bavaria to Otho of Nordheim, a treacherous and ungrateful instead of an open foe. Whoever became the chief counsellor of the Empress was immediately an object of universal dislike. She now placed her full confidence in the Bishop of Augsburg; but so unscrupulous was the jealousy of the rivals for her favor, so slight the confidence in the sanctity Hanno of Cologne. of the sacerdotal character, that the bishop's influence was attributed by popular rumor, not discountenanced by the highest in the land, to criminal intercourse. Agnes was no doubt blameless; but the haughtiness of the bishop confirmed the opinion that he must possess more than lawful power over her mind.¹ It was murmured abroad, among the people as well as by these great prelates and princes, that the King, now twelve years old, was kept entirely under female control, and not instructed either in manly studies or chivalrous amusements. A plot for his deliverance, or rather a design to obtain possession of his person, was contrived and conducted with consummate skill by Hanno and Siegfried, the Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz, by Otho of Bavaria, and the Count Ecbert. Hanno of Cologne undertook in person the abduction of the youthful Emperor from his mother's care. At Whitsuntide, after a joyous banquet on an island on the Rhine (that of Saint Suithbert),² Hanno invited the boy to embark in a gay and richly decorated barge, prepared for the occasion. No sooner was he Abduction of the King. on board than the rowers rose to their oars,

¹ On the death of this prelate Lambert says: "Obiit invisus regi, invisus episcopis omnibus, propter superbe administratam regni gubernationem tempore Imperatricis." — Lambert Hertzfeld.

² Near Neuss.

and the barge went rapidly though against the stream. The affrighted boy, thinking that their design could be nothing but his death, threw himself headlong into the stream. He was rescued by Count Ecbert, who plunged in after him at the peril of his life.¹ The multitude followed along the shore, resenting with loud but vain cries this insult upon the majesty of the Empire. But Hanno pursued his course; he soothed the popular indignation by artful declarations that he acted only for the public good. The gentle Empress, if wounded in her motherly feelings, relieved from an oppressive burden, contemplated immediate retirement into a convent, but was persuaded for a time to suspend her pious intention.²

The policy of the Empire, as to the Papacy, veered suddenly round. Duke Godfrey could hardly but be cognizant of this conspiracy. Both he and the whole Hildebrandine party hastened to take their advantage. The unworldly Damiani at this crisis cannot keep within his cloister. He plunges with as much zeal as Hildebrand himself, whose secular ambition at times so distresses the saint, into the political turmoil. He writes a letter to Hanno, hailing his success, and urging him to fulfil his design of discomfiting the scaly monster of Parma. His act is that of the good priest Jehoiada rescuing the pious youth of Joas from the influence of the wicked queen Athalia. But he has done nothing unless he tramples on the smouldering brand, the limb of the devil, the Antipope.³

¹ Bonizo, *Annalista Saxo*; Lambert, *sub an.* 1162.

² See the Letters of Damiani (vii. 6, 7, 8) urging her to contempt of imperial greatness.

³ Epist. iii. 6. Damiani is seized in this letter with a classical fit. He compares Cadalous descending on the bed of the apostolic throne in a

A council was summoned at Augsburg. Damiani appeared as a legate, the representative of the monkish and Hildebrandine party. Instead of a grave deliberation, a singular composition by Damiani was read — a disputation between the advocate of the Empire and the defender of the Papacy. ^{Council of Augsburg.} It was drawn up with much skill and some moderation. The defender of the Papacy does not openly contest the Imperial right to confirm the election of the Pope, though he suggests a long line of Popes who had ruled without such sanction. But during the infancy of the Emperor that right was in abeyance. The legate of the Roman cardinals had been refused a hearing at the Court; the clergy, therefore, were compelled to proceed to the election of Pope Alexander. In temporal affairs the mother of the Emperor might guide her son; but the Roman Church was the mother of the Emperor in a higher sense, and as his rightful guardian was to act for him in spiritual concerns. Gradually the Imperial advocate yields to the overpowering argument of the Papal defender; and the piece concludes with a fervent prayer that the Empire and the Papacy may henceforth be united in indissoluble alliance; that as the kingdom and the priesthood, founded by one Mediator, were blended together as in one holy sacrament, so by this mysterious union the King might be recognized in the Pontiff, the Pontiff in the Emperor, saving that incommunicable prerogative which belonged to the Pope alone; the King supreme in temporal Courts, the Pontiff with unlimited jurisdiction over the souls of men.

shower of gold with Jupiter descending into the bosom of *Diana*! — if this be not an error of the transcriber.

Damiani's triumph as an orator over an audience who needed no persuasion was most complete. Alexander was declared the rightful Pontiff, with full powers ; but Damiani's fame as a prophet was in some danger. The Oct. 29, 1062. election of the Antipope Cadalous had taken place on the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude in the last year. The council was held on the same festival in the present ; but Cadalous, instead of having closed his impious life, as Damiani had distinctly foretold, was in a state of dangerous activity. Damiani took refuge in the spiritual death inflicted by the excommunicatory decree of the Church at Augsburg.

Alexander II. had returned to Rome ; the Pope recognized by the higher clergy of Rome, by the council of Augsburg, by the Court of the youthful Emperor. But Cadalous did not abandon his pretensions. A large part of the Italian clergy still adhered to his cause ; he was in correspondence with the Empress and her partisans in Germany ; his wealth he devoted to increase his warlike resources ; above all, the barons of his faction in and about Rome, hating a Pope allied with the Normans, occupied the tower of Cencius (the Castle of St. Angelo), and kept the city in constant dread and insecurity.

Hanno of Cologne could not retain the authority which he had acquired with such boldness, but exercised with too much pride. In vain had he heaped imperial grants on his more powerful episcopal brethren, the Archbishops of Salzburg and Magdeburg, the Bishops of Freisingen and Halberstadt.¹ Gunther of Bamberg, for his loyal service, it was alleged, to the Empress, against whom he had been in open rebellion,

¹ Stenzel, *Frankische Kaiser*, i. 217.

received Forcheim, with thirty-six villages and townships, which Henry III. had alienated from the monastery. Those who thus obtained the spoils were discontented that they got no more; those who got nothing were only more exasperated against those who did, and against their misjudging patron. The young King could scarcely forgive the insult of his violent abduction, nor, if he had any natural affection (a doubtful point), his forcible separation from his mother; a deep repugnance against ecclesiastical tyranny may have taken root within his heart, hostile not only to the ambitious churchmen, who were encroaching more and more on the Imperial power, but to the wholesome restraints and holy influences of religion itself. But he could only hope to pass from the control of one hateful ecclesiastic to that of another better able and disposed to win his affections. Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, had every quality to rule a court, and the councils of a nation such as Germany Adalbert of Bremen then was. Of a commanding person (no one officiated in the Church with so much dignity and splendor), ready eloquence, great knowledge of business, he would not condescend to ask, scarcely to receive favors; while his lavish munificence gathered round him troops of admiring and ardent partisans. To these more worldly distinctions he added those peculiar to his profession, unblemished chastity, saintly piety. The church of Bremen, which he built, was of the noblest in Germany, and served with unrivalled magnificence; and he displayed that haughty humility which, while it constantly stooped to wash the feet of the poor, made him assert his equality with the proudest princes of the Empire. Adalbert became the guardian, the counsellor,

almost the friend and favorite of the youthful Henry ; and in him the loyal subject of the Empire predominated over the punctilious churchman.

Encouraged by this new revolution in the Imperial court, and on the invitation of his allies the Roman nobles, the Antipope made a second unexpected descent upon Rome. His faction commanded the gates of the Leonine city. He entered that district with all his forces ; but in the other quarters of Rome the partisans of Alexander made a brave resistance. Cadalous was attacked in the rear by the Norman troops, hardly escaped being made a prisoner, and was hurried by Cencius and his Roman allies into the castle of St. Angelo. In that impregnable fortress he maintained his position for two years. Rome had two Popes with their armed troops glaring defiance at each other from opposite quarters of the city. The spiritual thunders—each of course, and each in his synod, had hurled his direst excommunication at the other—were drowned in the louder din of arms.

The final possession of the Papacy still hung on the revolutions in the Imperial Court. For two years Adalbert of Bremen maintained his influence by his own stately respectfulness and courteous domination, and by the aid of Count Werner, the younger favorite and companion of Henry.¹ The affairs of state, the disposition of preferments, the Royal grants were left to Adalbert ; while the boy-Emperor and his friend were

¹ Bruno (de bello Saxonico) as a Saxon hated Henry. He is more full, not always decent, and by no means trustworthy, in his history. He charges Adalbert of Bremen with more than unepiscopal connivance: "Stultum dixit esse si non in omnibus satisfieret suæ desideriiis adolescentiæ."—i. 3.

allowed to devote themselves too exclusively to the light and unimproving pursuits of youth, the chase and other idle amusements. Adalbert committed the unpardonable error — more than error, the crime — of not endeavoring to bring up the young Emperor in habits of business suited to his station, to teach him the great lesson of commanding men, of commanding himself. Adalbert's own great qualities were leavened by an ostentatious vanity. His magnificent profusion soon exhausted even his vast resources. He could not supply his wants but by encroaching on the possessions of the great and comparatively defenceless monasteries. Some of these indeed, as it were, provoked the spoiler. The secular clergy in Germany — if the hatred between the regulars and seculars had not attained the same height as in other parts of Latin Christendom, in England, and in Lombardy — could not but envy and covet the often ill-gotten and ill-spent estates of the wealthier conventual foundations. While the more rigid monasteries denounced the vices of the clergy, and were the stern examples of piety and ascetic devotion, which put to shame the worldly, often warlike, lives of the prelates — not even the most pious declined the Court offerings and grants, which increased with the fame of their piety. The more worldly abbots, on the other hand, aspired in rank, in opulence, even in secular power, to an equality with the prince bishops. They, too, would be prince abbots. There were constant collisions. In a dispute for precedence between the Bishop of Hildesheim and the Abbot of Fulda in the church of Goslar, there was a wild battle A.D. 1063. between their armed followers; the King was present, and with difficulty extricated from the fray. The

Bishop was furious.¹ The Abbot was condemned as the cause of the tumult. The hatred of the seculars against the monks was hardly sated, though the Abbot bought his pardon by fines, which utterly ruined the abbey of Fulda, to the King, to his counsellors, to the Bishop. The feeling ran high against the Abbot. On his return to his convent he was encountered by an insurrection among his own monks, by whom he was hated for his tyranny. The younger and more violent broke from their cloister to lay their grievances before the King. But Henry's counsellors, Hanno of Cologne, Otho of Bavaria, would not encourage this monastic rebellion. The Abbot was restored by the soldiers of the King, and took his revenge on the contumacious monks. Some were publicly whipped, others condemned to fasting and imprisonment, some drafted off to other convents; but according to their birth and connections was their punishment.²

The great metropolitans, though in possession of their splendid sees, and now ruling absolutely in the
Plunder of
the Abbays. King's councils, were not great enough for their ambition. They did not plunder the magnates or the bishops, but it was from fear, not from respect. They wielded the whole power of the Empire; they sold all promotions, ecclesiastical and secular: yet this was not enough; the defenceless abbots were at their

¹ Lambert of Hertzfeld, *sub ann.* 1063. "Tum vero urgebat et ille Apostolicæ Sanctitatis et Mosaicæ mansuetudinis episcopus, qui tanti sanguinis manus suas Deo consecraverat, et violatæ ecclesiæ injurias truculentius atque immitius quam rex suas persequabatur . . . Abbatem, præter acerbitatem rei, quæ acciderat odium quoque gravabat nominis monachici, quod inveterata malitia hominis sæculi semper opprimere atque obfuscare conabatur." Lambert was a monk of Hertzfeld, not of Aschaffenburg. —Pertz

² "De singulis tamen non pro modo culpæ, sed pro natalitium suorum claritate vel obscuritate sumptum est supplicium." — Lambert.

mercy. Siegfried of Mentz was as rapacious as the Archbishops of Cologne and Bremen; for in this the common interests of Hanno and of Adalbert joined them in a common league. They condescended to throw part of the spoils to the King, and so bought his support. They asserted the King's power over the abbots and lands of the abbeys, and his right to grant them away, to be as full, as over his bailiffs and other administrators of the royal domains. The Archbishop of Bremen attempted to seize Laurisheim and New Corbey. Corbey was, however, rescued from his grasp. The Abbot of St. Lavers stood on the defensive. Archbishop Siegfried seized Seligenstadt. Hanno of Cologne, not content with a ninth part of the Imperial treasure, had for his share Cornelius-Munster and Malmedy. St. Remacle wrested his cloister from the rapacious prelate by wonders, in which his monks were singularly skillful.¹ The Bishop of Spire had two abbeys: the Archbishops of Magdeburg, Saltzburg, the Bishops of Halberstadt, Freisingen, Minden, Bamberg, whole villages, with large privileges. Nor were the nobles without their portion. Otho of Bavaria had the abbey of Kempten; the Duke of Saxony the castle of Retzburg; Werner, the King's favorite, estates of Charlemagne's favored Abbey of Hertzfeld. Werner added insult to spoliation. The monks of Hertzfeld took prayer and fasting against him. "See," said Werner, scoffingly, to the King, "I have roused these

¹ See the *Triumphus S. Remacii*, in which the monks of Etable contested the possession of Malmedy with Hanno, and by playing off the popular superstition, which the bishop and the King saw through, but could not resist, maintained possession of their property. — *Apud Chapeauville, Gesta Pontificum Leodensium*, ii. 517 *et seqq.* Floto (*Heinrich der Vierte*), i. p. 286 *et seqq.* gives this at great length.

monks to most unwonted devotion; they have taken to fasting and prayer." — And men wondered that the young King was not imbued with awe and reverence for the Church!

In the depression of the monasteries and the invasion of their possessions the rival prelates, Hanno of Cologne and Adalbert of Bremen, might agree: no one repudiated his share of the plunder.¹ But the strife between these two men was a kind of prelude to the great conflict between the Empire and the Church. Hanno sought to strengthen his power by establishing his friends and kindred in the great bishoprics. Adalbert aspired to be surrounded by a vassalage of temporal nobles. The minority of Henry was one long strife of ambition and violence, in which the Churchmen ever took the lead, strangely crossed with acts of the most profound and self-denying devotion. At the time when a powerful confederacy was secretly forming against the overweening power of Adalbert of Bremen, many of the greatest prelates in Germany were seized with a sudden passion of pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Siegfried of Mentz broke off his career of plunder. Gunther of Bamberg, Otho of Ratisbon, William of Utrecht, with many other distinguished ecclesiastics of France, as well as Germany, set out in the autumn of 1064 for the Holy Land. Their imprudent display of wealth excited the astonishment and, of course, the cupidity of the wild Mohammedans, through whose territories they passed. In one affray with these rude enemies, they escaped massacre only by the personal courage and strength of

¹ So writes Lambert, one of the sufferers. Compare Stenzel, *Die Frankische Kaiser*, i. 221. Stenzel in his *Beilage* gives a long and full list of lands seized by the great Prelates.

the Bishop of Bamberg ; and they were so fortunate as to buy the protection of a more powerful chieftain, who kept his word with true eastern fidelity. They returned to Germany, Gunther of Bamberg to die, Siegfried of Mentz to plunge again into the world ; he would compensate himself for the hardships of his pilgrimage by bolder gratification of his ambition and rapacity.

Adalbert of Bremen had ruled too absolutely, too ostentatiously in the court of the young King. His virtues were not less dangerous than his faults. His transcendent abilities awoke jealousy, his magnificence compelled him to more insatiate rapacity. He had more than his share in the plunder of the Empire.

The prelates and the secular princes combined for his overthrow — Hanno of Cologne, Siegfried of Mentz, Rudolph of Swabia, Otho of Bavaria, and the counts of Saxony — who hated Adalbert, and longed to plunder his wealthy bishopric, which in the north of Germany overshadowed their power and riches. They obtained the support of Godfrey of Tuscany, now in Germany. At a great diet at Tribur they boldly laid before the young King the alternative — the abandonment of his archiepiscopal minister, or the loss of his crown. Henry had been already cowed by the death of his favorite Count Werner in a fray at Ingelheim. He attempted to fly to Goslar with the insignia of the Empire. His palace was surrounded. Adalbert of Bremen was in danger of his life, and with difficulty, under a strong guard, he reached his bishopric. But the fallen man must fall still further. Duke Ordulf of Saxony, his son Magnus and his brother Herman, broke into the territories of the See. They threatened death to the archbishop ; he sought concealment in a distant

estate. At length he was compelled to make terms, by which he granted one third of his vast estates as a fief of the archiepiscopate to Magnus of Saxony; other estates to other secular princes.

The magnificent prelate who aspired to be the Patriarch of the north of Germany had to endure poverty. Alms ceased to be distributed in the splendid church of Bremen. So the administration of affairs returned to the bishops.¹

The fall of Adalbert crushed the lingering hopes of the Antipope Cadalous. Latterly he had been a prisoner rather than the master in the castle of St. Angelo; and Cencius only on hard terms permitted this usefully or rallying-point to his own faction, that of the old Roman nobles, to escape. Cadalous was obliged to pay 300 pounds of silver for the privilege of making a hasty and ignominious flight to the north of Italy.²

Hanno of Cologne, now all-powerful at the court of King Henry, had espoused the cause of Alexander II.; he was desirous, as a churchman, to put an end to this perilous and disgraceful schism; but he had too much of German pride to abandon altogether the imperial claims. With his confederates, the German princes and prelates, he summoned, in the name of the Emperor, a Council to meet at Mantua to decide the great cause. Himself, with a large retinue of German princes and three hundred knights, proceeded to Rome. A discussion was held with Hanno of Cologne on one side, Hildebrand on the other; Hanno asserting the right of the King, the Patrician of Rome, to con-

¹ "Sic iterum rerum publicarum administratio ad episcopos rediit." — Lambert. The temporal nobles were not too faithful to Adalbert.

² "Consenso strigosissimo equo inde solus aufugit." — Bonizo.

firm the Papal election; Hildebrand, the indefeasible liberties of the Church.

Alexander, or Alexander's counsellors, thought it more wise to confirm his title by the authority of a council. He condescended to appear, not doubtful of the event, at Mantua.

The Council of Mantua declared Alexander the legitimate Pope; but hardly was this done, when the city was disturbed by a sudden irruption of the soldiers of Cadalous, swarming through the city and heaping scorn on Alexander. Cadalous had raised these troops in his neighboring diocese of Parma: but Godfrey, Duke of Tuscany, the patron of Alexander, had guaranteed the security of the Pope. He drove the Parmesans in ignominious flight from the town.¹ The Lombard prelates threw themselves at the feet of Alexander and implored his forgiveness. This forgiveness is said to have extended to Cadalous himself, who nevertheless, though his friends fell off, never renounced the title of Pope. He died at last, almost forgotten by the world, except by the hatred of his enemies, which pursued him beyond the grave.² But either lest the German or Imperial interest should be too much depressed, or as the price of his abandonment of the Antipope, the author of the schism, Guibert the Chancellor was rewarded with the Archbishopric of Ravenna.

During the whole pontificate of Alexander II. the

¹ Lambert expresses the feelings of religious men on these scenes: "*Homines, non ut quondam ut præessent ecclesiæ Dei injectâ manu trahebantur, sed ne non præessent armata manu præliabantur, fundebantque mutuo sanguinem non pro ovibus Christi, sed ne non dominarentur ovibus Christi. Anselmus tamen, qui et Alexander, et virtute militum et favore principum sedem obtinuit.*" — *Sub ann. 1064.*

² "*Eodem tempore Cadalous Parmensis Episcopus corpore et animâ defunctus est.*" — Bonizo, p. 810

Strife about married clergy. strife in Lombardy and in other parts of Northern Italy had continued with but remitting obstinacy. Alexander in his first address, as a Milanese, to the clergy and people of Italy, had declared the enforced celibacy of the priesthood the great object of his pontifical ambition.¹ Damiani did not hold his peace; he bitterly complained that the Simoniac and Nicolaitan heresies, which he thought he had suppressed, had broken out again. He addressed, or more actively promulgated, an invective against the married clergy, even more furious than before. Phineas is his favorite example of zeal, Eli of criminal indulgence in the fathers of the Church, as abstaining from using the sword of vengeance.² Damiani, Pope Alexander, fulminated not in vain.

Landulph, one of the sworn triumvirate of Milan, A.D. 1065. had died; but a more implacable adversary of the married clergy rose up in his place — his brother Herlembald,³ of a stern, warlike character. An event

¹ "Speramus autem in eo qui de virgine dignatur est nasci, quia nostri ministerii tempore sancta clericorum castitas exaltabitur, et incontinentium luxuria cum cæteris hæresibus confundetur." — Epist. Alex. II. ad clerum populumque Mediolanensem.

² See two letters to Ariald, v. 14, 15. Damiani's Commentary on the Old Testament is rather bold. He confounds Phineas with Elijah! Phineas was rewarded for his act of zeal with a life of 620 years. Eli's guilt is aggravated, for he was a *metropolitan*, Hophni and Phineas only *bishops*. The coarse indecency of this model of monkhood might provoke laughter, if laughter were not sobered by disgust: "Sanctis eorum femoribus volui seras apponere; tentavi genitalibus sacerdotum, ut ita loquar, continentias fibulas adhibere." — De Cœleb. Sacerd. Opusc. If the evil were concealed it might, perhaps, be tolerated; but it is public, notorious; names, places, are bruited abroad: "Nomina concubinarum, socerorum quoque et socruum, fratrum denique et quorumlibet propinquorum." If lavish gifts, jests, secret meetings, betray them not; "omnis dubietas tollitur," there are "uteri timentes et pueri vagientes."

³ Herlembald's person and character are described at length. — Landulph, lii. 13.

in Herlembald's early life had embittered his heart against the less rigid clergy. His plighted bride had behaved lightly with a priest: Herlembald indignantly broke off his marriage. He then made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and was just returned, with his whole soul full of religious enthusiasm. He soon ruled in Milan, by espousing the faction of the people against the nobles;¹ and with their aid proceeded to assail the married priests. It was a spiritual tyranny exercised by a layman, though in conjunction with his brother-colleague Arialdi, and maintained by armed partisans. Obnoxious priests were dragged from the altar, and consigned to shame and insult.² The services of the Church, the most holy sacraments, were suspended altogether, or administered only by the permission of Herlembald.

It is said that, in order to keep his rude soldiery in pay, he made every one in holy orders take a solemn oath that he had never known woman since the day of his ordination. For those who refused the oath, their whole property was confiscated. The lowest rabble, infected with Paterinism, poor artisans and ass-drivers, furtively placed female ornaments in the chambers of priests, and then attacking their houses, dragged them out and plundered their property. Herlembald assumed the title of standard-bearer of the Church. Pope Alexander, at the instigation of Hildebrand, bestowed upon him a consecrated banner.³ Sometimes these ecclesiastical tribunes condescended to argument and expostulation; but their usual reasoning was force. Herlem-

¹ See note quoted from Petrus Arragonensis by Puricelli, ad Vit. Arialdi, apud Bolland: June 27.

² Landulph, iii. 20.

³ Vit. Arialdi

bald assumed a power far above that of the archbishop. His followers contested, indeed, the title and authority of the archbishop, no doubt as guilty of simony, of which they had constituted themselves judges as well as avengers.¹

Guido at length, after nearly nine years of silent strife, determined on an attempt to throw off the yoke. The churches of Milan were for the most part without ministers. The married clergy had been expelled, and there were none to take their place.² A synod at Novara

¹ "Guido qui dicebatur archepiscopus." And Ariald in his hour of martyrdom will not own Guido for archbishop.—Vit. Ariald.

² Among the most curious parts of Landulph's history, and among the most singular documents of his age, is his account of a conference held in the presence of Herlembald on the marriage of the clergy. The speeches on both sides are given at length. The debate is opened by Guibert, the archdeacon, who boldly broaches the doctrine that all Christians, laity as well as clergy, are priests: "Forsitan cogitatis, quod de Laicis tantum dicat, de quibus non est dubium habere conjugem. Omnes tamen, Laici et Clerici, *quicunque sunt filii ecclesie, sacerdotes sunt.*" Landulph, perhaps, has not done justice to the arguments of Ariald; more than justice to his opponents. The most remarkable speech of all, however, is that of Andrew, "Sacerdos Decumanus." He dwelt most vividly on the gross immoralities which, as he believed—and he appealed to general experience—inevitably followed the interdiction of marriage to the clergy: "Et si mihi de naturâ humanâ non credis, maximè non credis de ordine nostro, qui dum magis constringitur, amplius illicitis accenditur; vel tibi, quod olim fuisti, vel eras, [vel] esse poteris, crede. Vetando unam et propriam uxorem centum fornicatrices ac adulteria mille concedis; præterea vitium detestabile (ob quod quidam ex tuis simulantes sese caste vivere uxoribus falsâ religione dimissis, vitio imbuti detestabili, in theatro populi tracti, et in fronte decocti sunt), te amicè tangendo deterreat." He indignantly inveighs against the violence of the celibate faction: "thou hast separated us from our wives, thou that art more righteous than the Apostles; holier than the Prophets; purer than the Patriarchs; not by justice, not by charity, but by spears and swords, and every kind of persecution." He accuses them of holding the ascetic doctrines of "those of Monteforte," who proscribed all connexion between the sexes. He repels the argument that a priest cannot offer at the altar if polluted by contact with a wife. The priest who has a wife cannot serve God faithfully, if he loves his wife more than God: that is all. Yet Andrew does not pretend to excuse a priest who marries after he is in orders: he must suffer the penalty of that breach of discipline, but

(1065) summoned Herlembald and Ariald to render an account of their proceedings. Their answer was silent contempt. At length the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against Ariald and Herlembald as refractory. But the inflexible Ariald appealed to Rome. He sent letters to inquire what course was to be pursued with this bishop, whom he loaded with the appellations of simoniac and adulterer. Damiani again blew a fierce blast from his monastic trumpet, and urged on these indefatigable warriors to extirpate this Nicolaitan heresy, as Jesus, from whose mouth goes forth the two-edged sword, will hew down all his enemies, and pour their blood on the earth.¹

But Ariald presumed beyond his strength. He had returned from Rome armed with full powers, with the ban of the Church pronounced against Guido, which had been extorted from the reluctant Pope by the more intrepid Hildebrand. The people of Milan had borne his tyrannous sway; they had aided him in his persecution of the married clergy; and of those accused of simony. But now the manifest object of Ariald and Herlembald was the total subjugation of Milan to Rome, the abrogation of all her peculiar rites and privileges. When, therefore, Ariald began to interfere with the ritual, received by constant tradition from St. Ambrose himself—to command a fast on certain days on which St. Ambrose had appointed no fast—to preach against, to treat as heathen a fast and procession on Ascension Day, instituted by St. Ambrose—he fell at once from

he protests against dissolving, even in the case of such priest, the indissoluble union. — Landulph, iii. c. 25. Compare with this Damiani's dispute with the chaplain of Duke Godfrey, Epist. v. 13

¹ Epist. v. 14.

the commanding height of his popularity.¹ The factions of the different litanies met in conflict on more equal terms. The Archbishop himself, whose life had been in danger during the strife, headed the insurrection. The whole of Milan was summoned to meet in the great church at Pentecost. Guido appealed to the people: "Let all who love St. Ambrose leave the church." Of seven thousand persons, but twelve remained with Ariald and with Herlembald. They stood near the altar to protect or to be protected by it. The partisans of Guido rushed to the attack; the clergy selected Ariald, the laity Herlembald, for their victim. Ariald was dragged from the church sorely wounded; Herlembald escaped better. At night his followers rallied, and rescued them both from their enemies. Six men, probably of note, were killed. The palace of the archbishop was stormed and pillaged. They then attacked the church. The aged Guido barely escaped, sorely maltreated in the tumult. But the nobles, the more distinguished of the citizens, the vassals of the Church, would endure this tyranny no longer. Guido of Landriano placed himself at their head; the city was laid under interdict; no service was to be performed, no bell sounded, till Ariald should be driven from the city. So great was the fury of Milan against Ariald, that he fled to Legnano. He fell into the hands of Oliva, the niece of Archbishop Guido. She carried him to an island on the Lago Maggiore. There she demanded whether he would acknowledge Guido for archbishop (he had been excommunicated by Rome). "As long as my tongue can speak," he replied, "I will not acknowledge him."

June 28,
1066.

¹ Tristan Calchi, vi. 133.

The servants of Oliva, after a more shameful mutilation, tore out his tongue, and left him half-dead. Landulph, his former colleague, had suffered before his death from a disease in the tongue; and thus, says the hostile historian, "God punished these men by the member which was the cause of all their wickedness." Ariald soon found and still holds his place as a martyr in the annals of the church.¹

The strife was not allayed by the death of Ariald, nor by the appearance of two Papal legates, the Cardinal Bishop of Sylva Candida, and the Cardinal priest John Minuto. They passed strong constitutions against simony and the married clergy.² Herlembald, who had fled to Pavia, returned, regained his power, A.D. 1068-9. and, openly supported by the Pope's authority, reorganized his tyranny. Guido, as he advanced in years, became more consciously incapable of rule. He had been archbishop twenty-seven years, the last ten of civil war. He determined to vacate the see: he burdened it with a fixed pension to himself, and then made it over to a certain Godfrey. To him he resigned the pastoral staff, and the ring of investiture bestowed by the Emperor. Godfrey crossed the Alps, and promised the King, if he would grant the investiture, to destroy Pateria (so the adversaries of the monastic party opprobriously named them), take Herlembald alive, and send him prisoner into Germany. The Emperor, won, or bribed, as it is said, ratified the appointment.³

¹ The least credible part of Landulph, the historian's story, is the public confession of his errors, which he ascribes to Ariald, who humbly owns himself guilty of the blood of his fellow-citizens, as the cause of countless fornications, adulteries, and even worse crimes, among the clergy.

² "Constitutiones, quas S. Legati Mediolanensibus observandas præscribunt." — *Mansi*, xix.

³ *Benzo*.

But Herlembald, who now conducted himself not merely as secular tyrant, but as a Pope in Milan, refused to acknowledge Godfrey, expelled him from the city, and besieged him in Castiglione. Guido, not receiving his stipulated pension, annulled his resignation, and resumed his state as archbishop. But he unwisely trusted himself to the faith of Herlembald; he was seized, and shut up in a monastery till his death.¹

Before the death of Guido, Herlembald had set up a certain Atto,² nominated by himself with the legate of Rome by his side, and without regard to the Church of Milan or their liege lord the Emperor. Atto was but a youth, just entered into holy orders. The people were furious, rose and attacked the archbishop's palace, tore him from his refuge in an upper chamber, dragged him by the legs and arms into the church, and there compelled him to renounce his dignity. The Roman legate hardly escaped with his robes torn.

During this strife Milan had suffered two dreadful fires, A.D. 1071-75. which burned down some of the finest churches, as well as a large part of the city. These calamities goaded the factions to more relentless cruelty: as each party would attribute them to the direct wrath of God, so each would receive them as the summons to wreak vengeance on their adversaries, thus designated the foes of God as of themselves. Herlembald, now strong in the armed protection of the great Hildebrand³ (we have reached his pontificate), maintained his power; yet so vigorous and inflexible was the party called that of the married clergy, that it prolonged the contest on the

¹ Giulini, iv. 140; Verri, p. 173.

² Atto was sanctioned as archbishop by the Pope in 1072.

³ Landulph (the historian) says of Herlembald: "*Solum Romani illius Hildebrandi auscultabat consultum.*"

whole during twenty years,¹ and obtained at last a temporary triumph in the death of Herlembald.²

This man at length fell in an insurrection: the standard of St. Peter was trampled in the dust. Liutprand, a priest of his faction, was mutilated, his ears and his nose cut off. His enemies would scarcely allow Herlembald decent burial. A solemn procession passed to the Ambrosian Church, with hymns of thanksgiving for the deliverance of the Church of Milan from her oppressor.³ Yet he, too, is placed as a martyr in the calendar of Christian saints.⁴ The canonization of these two religious demagogues, who, whatever may be thought of their spiritual objects, governed by popular insurrections and plunder, by carnage — which did not respect the most sacred persons, by exaction, and by every kind of persecution, closes this melancholy chapter in church history.

It was not in Milan alone that the war raged against the married clergy; nor wholly in the Milan- 1075-6. ese that the married clergy were strong enough to maintain a long and obstinate resistance to the Hildebrandine yoke.⁵ In Monza, in Cremona, in Piacenza, in Pavia, in Padua, in Asti, fierce feuds, as fierce as the later con-

¹ "Crescebat quotidie numerus infidelium, et de die in diem numerus minuebatur Paterinorum." — Bonizo, p. 813.

² The enemies of Herlembald were the Capitanei and Valvassores (these Hullman interprets bas vassaux), the simple populace: "Dicentes se integritatem beati Ambrosii velle jurare."

³ Arnulf.

⁴ In his epitaph it is said: "Hunc Veneris servi perimunt, Simonisque magistri."

⁵ Verri in his *Storia Milanese* adduces strong reasons for supposing that the married priests continued to exercise their functions, however with greater caution, in the Milanese. A synod, held in 1098, condemns the abuse of the clergy handing down their benefices to their children by a kind of hereditary succession.

flicts of Guelfs and Ghibellines, disturbed the streets, not without bloodshed. Alexander II. addressed a hortatory letter to the Cremonese ; it rung like a tocsin through the city. The people rose upon the married clergy.¹

But in Florence the secular clergy, headed by Peter, the Bishop of Florence, opposed a long but vain resistance to the monks, those especially of Vallombrosa, with their abbot, hereafter sainted, John Gualberto. The legend of this holy man is among the most striking in hagiology. He was of noble Florentine birth ; his brother had been murdered. The honor of his house, paternal love, the solemn imprecation of his father, imposed upon Gualberto the sacred duty of avenging his brother's blood. He brooded in fixed and sullen determination over this settled purpose. One day (it was Good Friday) he met his destined victim, the murderer, in a narrow pass : he drew his sword to plunge it to the heart of the guilty man. The assassin attempted no defence, but threw himself from his horse, and folded his arms over his breast in the form of a cross. Gualberto held his arm—he forgave for the sake of that holy sign. He rode on to pay his devotions in the Church of San Miniato ; the crucifix seemed to bow towards him, as if in approval of his holy deed. From that moment Gualberto was a monk in heart as in life. He found a hermitage under the dark pines of Vallombrosa, on the banks of the Acqua Bella. The hermitage grew into a monastery ; and of all cloisters none was so rigid as that of Vallombrosa ; later times had seen no monk so austere, so self-mortified, as John Gualberto. Peter, Bishop of Florence, was accused as a

¹ See authorities in Theiner, p. 133 ; Benzo, p. 808, 9.

Simoniac ; the protection of Peter Damiani, who at first endeavored to repress the intemperate zeal of the monks, may seem to absolve the prelate from this charge. But the secular clergy of Florence were deeply tainted it is said by this vice ; they lived separate, there were no colleges of canons — an unmarried clergyman was rare — they were intent on their worldly interests, the heritage of their children, or provisions for their families.¹

The strife lasted for many years. Gualberto denounced Peter, the simoniac Bishop, in the streets of Florence ; the monks of Vallombrosa renounced all allegiance to their sullied prelate. Appeals to Rome were in vain ; the Pope Alexander inclined to milder and more conciliatory measures ; Hildebrand hailed the kindred spirit of his friend, the abbot Gualberto, and maintained with his more than Papal authority the cause of the monks.

But the monks had determined on, they had repeatedly urged, an appeal to a higher authority even than Rome, to God himself. They demanded the ordeal of fire. There was a fierce commotion in Florence. Many of the clergy had been awed by the denunciations of Gualberto and the monks ; they fell off from the bishop, they declared that they could not obey a simoniac prelate. The civil authorities were summoned to drive the refractory priests from their residences. The

¹ "Quæ enim lingua etiamsi ferrea ipsius cuncta posset referre bona? Quæ clericorum congregatio vitam erat ducens communem? Quis clerico-
rum propriis et paternis rebus solummodo non studebat? Qui potius inveniretur, proh dolor! qui non esset uxoratus vel concubinaris? De simoniâ quid dicam? Omnes pene ecclesiastico sordines hæc mortifera bel-
lua devoraverat, ut, qui ejus morsum evaserit, rarus inveniretur." — Andreas
Strum. in Vita S. Gualberti, apud Bolland, July 12. Atto says: "Exemplo
vero ipsius et admonitionibus delicati cleri spretis connubiis cœperunt simul
in Ecclesiis stare, et communem ducere vitam."

populace arose, ever on the sterner, as they thought the more religious, side ; women ran about rending their veils, beating their breasts, and shrieking wildly. There was a loud cry : “ Christ, thou art driven out ! Simon Magus will endure thee no longer ! ”

A great rout, at least 5,000, with monks at their head, marched forth to Settimo, a monastery dependent on Vallombrosa, a few miles from Florence. At Settimo had been prepared two lofty scaffolds ; between them a narrow path, heaped with dry wood. The scaffolds were crowded with spectators, who gazed in transports of weeping devotion on the celebration of the mass below, by a popular monk named Peter,¹ appointed as the champion of his cause by Gualberto. As the *Agnus Dei* was sung, four priests advanced, one bearing the cross, one with holy water, one with the swinging censer, one with two lighted torches. There was a wild intonation throughout all the people of the *Kyrie Eleison* — prayers to Christ, to the Virgin, to St. Peter — then all was silence. The mass was over ; Peter, the monk, advanced in slow procession, amid the chanting of the *Litanies* and of the *Psalms* — he bore the cross. An abbot uttered a solemn prayer that this ordeal might root out the simony which reigned throughout the world. Peter knelt and prayed with deep fervor : “ If Peter, Bishop of Florence, be a simoniac, may I pass unscathed through the flames.” “ Amen ! ” answered the awe-struck crowd. He gave and received the kiss of peace from his brethren. He waved the cross over the burning wood ; walked slowly through the hissing flames,

¹ The monk who passed the ordeal was called afterwards *Petrus Igneus*. He became Bishop of Albano. Berthold *Apud Pertz*, with note of *Usserian*, p. 273 ; the whole account chiefly from Berthold, in 1071, p. 109.

over the glowing embers. He passed unhurt; it was said that even the hairs on his feet were unsinged. All rushed around him, pressed his feet, the folds of his garments. There was one shout of triumph, demanding the degradation of the Bishop. Peter, a man of gentle character, yielded to the storm; he withdrew from Florence, but he retained his bishopric till his death.¹

The death of Alexander II. (after a pontificate of nearly twelve years, including the contest Oct. 1, 1061; with Cadalous) was neither sudden nor unex- April 21, 1073. pected; the election of his successor could not but be a subject of intense public anxiety. In Anselm of Lucca, the pontificate had been restored to Italy: would Rome any longer endure the bitter ignominy, that no one of her clergy, according to the precedence assigned to them by the decree of Pope Nicolas and the Lateran Council, was fit to be elevated to the shrine of St. Peter? Hildebrand had already for more than two pontificates been virtually Pope; the popular voice had described him as Lord of the Pope; would he still condescend to a subordinate station, and out of humility, policy, timidity, decline the ostensible supremacy? An unusual fast of three days might indicate that some measure of more than ordinary solemnity was in contemplation.

The clergy were assembled in the Lateran church to celebrate the obsequies of Alexander; Hildebrand, as Archdeacon, was performing the mournful service. At

¹ Theiner adduces evidence that he was recognized by the Pope some time after his supposed degradation. The Mantuan biographer of S. Gualberto will not permit his triumph to be incomplete. The inscription bears:—

“Ast ille ejectus Petrus fuit illico ab omni
Sede sua sacra Pontificisque loco.”

once from the whole multitude of clergy and people arose a simultaneous cry, "Hildebrand is Pope!" "St. Peter chooses the Archdeacon Hildebrand!" The Archdeacon rushed towards the pulpit to allay the tumult, and either with real or assumed modesty to repel the proffered honor; but Hugo the White, a cardinal presbyter of weight and influence, yet under the accusation of simony and excommunicated by the late Pope, eager perhaps to retrieve his endangered position, at once came forward and made himself heard above the acclamations of the multitude. "Well know ye," he said, "beloved brethren, that since the days of the blessed Leo this tried and prudent Archdeacon has exalted the Roman See, and delivered this city from many perils. Wherefore, since we cannot find any one better qualified for the government of the Church or the protection of the city, we, the bishops and cardinals, with one voice elect him as the pastor and bishop of your souls." The voice of Hugo was drowned in universal cries, "It is the will of St. Peter; Hildebrand is Pope." Hildebrand was led to the Papal throne; he was presented to the people as a man of profound theological knowledge, as a man of prudence, a lover of equity and justice, firm in adversity, temperate in prosperity; according to the apostolic words, of good conversation; blameless, modest, sober, chaste, hospitable, one that ruleth his own house; a man well brought up in the bosom of his Mother Church, and advanced already for his distinguished merits to the dignity of Archdeacon. "This our Archdeacon then we choose, to be called henceforth and for ever by the name of Gregory, for our Pontiff, as the successor of the Apostle." He was immediately arrayed with the scarlet robe, crowned with the Papal

tiara, and, reluctant and in tears, enthroned in the chair of St. Peter.¹

Hildebrand wept ! Were they tears of pride and joy, or of humility and sadness, or of mingling and conflicting emotions ? It was impossible but that his ambition, his conscious superiority, must long have contemplated this ultimate advancement ; but even his firm mind, in its profound religious devotion, may have been shaken at this crisis in his life. The higher Hildebrand estimated the power of the Pope, the more awful the responsibility. According to his view the Pope stood alone on earth between God and man ; the destinies of the human race, the temporal no less than the eternal destinies, which must depend on the issue of the imminent contest into which he was about to plunge, hung henceforward upon his acts and words. The monk was not entirely dead within him ; to his monastic friends, especially to Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino, afterwards his successor, he imparts, with seeming sincerity, the struggle of mind with which he undertook the inevitable office.²

He commenced his reign with temper and prudence. The decree of Nicolas II. had acknowledged that, in the last instance, after the nomination of the Cardinals, the ratification by the clergy and by the people of Rome, the assent of the Emperor was necessary to complete the full legal title. Gregory despatched messengers to Germany to inform Henry IV. of his elevation, and to receive his assent. It is said that at the same time he warned the Emperor not to sanction his nomination ; the warning was couched in words of pro-

¹ Bonizo, sub ann. 1073. Compare Jaffé, *Regesta*, p. 401.

² April 24.

phetic minacity : " If I be indeed made Pope, I must no longer patiently endure your great and flagrant excesses." ¹ But this is probably the language of later admirers of the great theocrat, who would at once invest him in all the terrors which he afterwards assumed. In the decree of Nicolas the assent of the Emperor had been reduced almost to a form ; Gregory was a rigid and punctilious observer of forms, and it was most important that there should be no flaw whatever in his charter, no defect of which his enemies might avail themselves hereafter in his title. But by such language, thus more than usually offensive and contemptuous, Gregory himself raised the form into a reality. The words imputed to him absolutely submitted the validity of his election to the Emperor, and acknowledged the Emperor's power to cancel his promotion. It is utterly irreconcilable with his character, directly at issue with the lofty principles so soon, so firmly, and so haughtily maintained by Hildebrand, to suppose that if the Emperor had refused his assent he would quietly have descended from the Pontifical throne ; it was either base hypocrisy, or a perfidious attempt to betray the Emperor at once into hostile proceedings. If it be true — if the address of Gregory was more severe than the ordinary parental admonitions which were wont to form part of the Papal addresses to sovereigns — if more than a grave or tender remonstrance against his personal conduct — Gregory must have been prepared to discharge his conscience with this deliberate defiance, with

¹ " *Interminatusque (sc. al.) si ejus electioni assensum præbuisset, nunquam ejus nequitiam patienter portaturum.*" — Bonizo, p. 811. " *Ne assensum præberet, ipsum attentius exoravit. Quod si non faceret certum sibi esset, quod graviores et manifestos ipsius excessus impunitos nullatenus toleraret.*" — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit.

which he cancelled beforehand any claim upon his gratitude for the assent of the Emperor, and held himself at full liberty to appear as an open adversary of the Empire in defence of the loftiest pretensions of the Papacy. It was presuming, too, somewhat over boldly on the timidity and irresolution of the Emperor and his council. Hildebrand's character was too well known — it had been known for too many years — not to excite apprehensions of his ambitious views in Germany. He was an Italian — a Roman prelate. His austerity would alarm all who were either guilty or under the imputation of simoniacal or incontinent lives; he would have many adversaries even among the better, but not unambitious, German Prelates. Henry was in truth strongly urged to annul at once the election. “If he did not at once tame this violent man, on no one would the storm fall so heavily as on himself.” Count Eberhard of Nellenberg was sent to Rome to demand of the Romans why they had presumed, contrary to ancient usage, to elect the Pope without previous consultation of the Emperor; if the answer was unsatisfactory, Eberhard was to insist on the abdication of Gregory.¹ But Count Eberhard was received with courteous deference by Gregory, who declared that he had not sought, but that the honor had been forced upon him by the clergy and the people. He had, however, deferred, and should defer, his inauguration until he had received the assent of the King. This skilful concession was accepted. Eberhard returned to Germany. Gregory Bishop of Vercelli, the Chancellor of Italy,

¹ Lambert. Floto rejects this, but Lambert could hardly have invented Eberhard's mission. The high Papalists, less politic than Hildebrand, afterwards denied the fact, because they would not acknowledge the right.

was sent to Rome to signify the Imperial assent.¹ Hildebrand thus assumed the Pontifical power unembarrassed by a contested title. Yet the watchful Pope still took every opportunity of asserting indirectly the independence of the Papacy. His name of Gregory VII. was a declaration that Gregory VI., whose Pontificate had been annulled by the Imperial authority, was a legitimate Pope.

¹ Bonizo.

BOOK VII.—CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPES.	EMPEROR OF GERMANY.	KING OF FRANCE.	KINGS OF ENGLAND.	KINGS OF SPAIN.	KINGS OF DENMARK.	EMPERORS OF THE EAST.
A.D. 1073 Gregory VII.	A.D. 1056 Henry IV.	A.D. 1060 Philip I.	A.D. 1066 William the Conqueror	A.D. Castile, — 1072 Alfonso VI., the Valiant	A.D. 1076 Canute IV, the Salt	A.D. 1072 Ducus 1078 Nicophorus Botaniates
1080 (Guibert. Clement III. Antipope)	1106			1109	1086 Olaus II.	1081
1086 Victor III.				Arragon.	1086 Eric the Good.	Alexius Comnenus
1088 Urban II.			1087 William Rufus	1087 Sancho 1094 Peter I.		1118
1100			1100	1103		
ARCHBISHOPS OF MILAN.	ARCHBISHOPS OF MENTZ.	ARCHBISHOPS OF RHEIMS.	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.	EARL OF PORTUGAL.	KINGS OF NAPLES.	KINGS OF HUNGARY.
A.D. 1076 Tedaldo.	A.D. 1060 Siegfried	A.D. 1068 Manasses I.	A.D. 1070 Lanfranc	A.D. 1088 Henry I.	A.D. Robert Guiscard	A.D. 1083 Solomon
Anselm	1084 Wezil 1088 Ruthard	1093 Rainald	1093 Anselm.		1085 Roger I. (Sicily)	1074 Geisa 1077 Ladislaus I. 1095 Koloman
1093	1088	1096			1111	1114

BOOK VII.



CHAPTER I.

HILDEBRAND.

HILDEBRAND was now Pope; the great contest for the dominion over the human mind, the strife between the temporal and spiritual power, which had been carried on for some centuries as a desultory and intermitting warfare, was now to be waged boldly, openly, implacably, to the subjugation of one or of the other. Sacerdotal, or rather Papal Christianity, had not yet fulfilled its mission, for, the Papal control withdrawn, the sacerdotal rule would have lost its unity, and with its unity its authority must have dissolved away. Without the clergy, not working here and there with irregular and uncombined excitement on the religious feelings of man, awakening in one quarter a vigorous enthusiasm, while in other parts of Europe men were left to fall back into some new Christian heathenism, or into an inert habitual Christianity of form; without the whole order laboring on a fixed and determined system, through creeds sanctified by ancient reverence, and a ceremonial guarded by rigid usage: without this vast uniform, hierarchical

Pope Gregory
VII.
April 22,
A.D. 1073.

influence, where, in those ages of anarchy and ignorance, of brute force and dormant intelligence, had been Christianity itself? And looking only to its temporal condition, what had the world been without Christianity?

The Papacy has still the more splendid part of its destiny to accomplish. It has shown vital The Papacy. power enough to recover from its seemingly irrecoverable degradation. It might have been supposed that a moral and religious depravation so profound, would utterly have destroyed that reverence of opinion, which was the one groundwork of the Papal power. The veil had been raised; and Italy at least, if not Europe, had seen within it, not a reflex of divine majesty and holiness, but an idol not only hideous to the pure moral sentiment, but contemptible for its weakness. If centuries of sanctity had planted deeply in the heart of man his veneration for the successor of St. Peter, it would have been paralyzed (the world might expect) and extinguished by more than a century of odious and unchristian vices. A spiritual succession must be broken and interrupted by such unspiritual inheritors. Could the head of Christendom, living in the most unchristian wickedness, perpetuate his descent, and hand down the patrimony of power and authority, with nothing of that piety and goodness which was at least one of his titles to that transcendent power?

But that idea or that opinion would not have endured for centuries, had it not possessed strength enough to reconcile its believers to contradictions and inconsistencies. With all the Teutonic part of Latin Christendom, the belief in the supremacy of the Pope was coeval with their Christianity; it was an article of their original creed as much as the Redemption; their

apostles were commissioned by the Pope ; to him they humbly looked for instruction and encouragement, even almost for permission to advance upon their sacred adventure. Augustine, Boniface, Ebbo, Anschar, had been papal missionaries. If the faith of Italy was shaken by too familiar a view of that which the Germans contemplated with more remote and indistinct veneration, the national pride, in Rome especially, accepted the spiritual as a compensation for the loss of the temporal supremacy ; it had ceased to be the centre of the Imperial—it would not endure not to be that of ecclesiastical dominion. The jealousy of a Pope elected, or even born, elsewhere than in Italy, showed the vitality of that belief in the Papacy, which was belied by so many acts of violence towards individual Popes. The religious minds would be chiefly offended by the incongruity between the lives and the station of the Pope ; but to them it would be a part of religion to suppress any rebellious doubts. Their souls were deeply impressed with the paramount necessity of the unity of the Church ; to them the Papacy was of divine appointment, the Pope the successor of St. Peter : all secret questioning of this integral part of their implanted faith was sin. However then they might bow down in shame and sorrow at the inscrutable decrees of Heaven, in allowing its Vicegerent thus to depart from his original brightness, yet they would veil their faces in awe, and await in trembling patience the solution of that mystery. In the Christian mind in general, or rather the mind within the world of Christendom, the separation between Christian faith and Christian morality was almost complete. Christianity was a mere unreasoning assent to certain dogmatic truths, an

unreasoning obedience to certain ceremonial observances. Controversy was almost dead. In the former century, the predestinarian doctrines of Gotschalk, in general so acceptable to the popular ear, had been entirely suppressed by the sacerdotal authority. The tenets of Berengar concerning the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, had been restrained, and were to be once more restrained, by the same strong hand; and Berengar's logic was beyond his age. The Manichean doctrines of the Paulicians and kindred sects were doubtless spreading to a great extent among the lower orders, but as yet in secrecy, breaking out now in one place, now in another, yet everywhere beheld with abhorrence, creating no wide alarm, threatening no dangerous disunion. In all the vulgar of Christendom (and that vulgar comprehended all orders, all ranks) the moral sentiment, as more obtuse, would be less shocked by that incongruity which grieved and oppressed the more religious. The great body of Christians in the West would no more have thought of discussing the character of the Pope, than the attributes of God. He was to them the apostle, the vicegerent of God, enveloped in the same kind of awful mystery. They feared the thunders of the Lateran as those of heaven; and were no more capable of sound discrimination as to the limits, grounds, and nature of that authority, than as to the causes of the destructive fire from the clouds. Their general belief in the judgment to come was not more deeply rooted than in the right of the clergy, more especially the head of the clergy, to anticipate, to declare, or to ratify their doom.

The German line of Pontiffs had done much to reinvest the Papacy in its ancient sanctity. The

Italian Alexander II. had been at least a blameless Pontiff, and now every qualification which could array the Pope in imposing majesty, in what bordered on divine worship, seemed to meet in Gregory VII. Character. His life verified the splendid panegyric with which he had been presented by Cardinal Hugo to the Roman people. He had the austere virtue, the most simple piety, the fame of vast theologic knowledge, the tried ability to rule men, intrepidity which seemed to delight in confronting the most powerful; a stern singleness of purpose, which, under its name of Churchmanship, gave his partisans unlimited reliance on his firmness and resolution, and yet a subtle policy which bordered upon craft. To them his faults were virtues; his imperiousness the due assertion of his dignity; his unfounded ambition zeal in God's cause: no haughtiness could be above that which became his station. The terror by which he ruled (he was so powerful that he could dispense with love), as it was the attribute of the Divinity now exclusively worshipped by man, so was it that which became the representative of God on earth.

Hildebrand, if not a Roman by birth, was an adopted Roman by education. He was of humble origin; so humble as to be obscure, almost doubtful. His father was a carpenter in Saona, a small town on the southern border of Tuscany. His name implies a Teutonic descent, though later adulation allied it with the great Roman house, the Aldobrandini. His later glory, as usual, cast back a preternatural splendor on his early life: prognostics of his future greatness began to embellish the dark years of his infancy and youth. His youth was passed in a monastic house in Rome, St. Mary on the Aven-

Birth and
youth of
Hildebrand.

tine, of which his uncle was abbot. That Abbot, named Lawrence, if the same who was afterwards Archbishop of Amalfi, was a man of ability and reputation. The disposition of Hildebrand was congenial to his education. He was a monk from his boyhood. Mortification in the smallest things taught him that self-command and rigor which he was afterwards to enforce on himself and on mankind: it was his self-imposed discipline, perhaps his pride, to triumph over every indulgence of the senses, even on the most trivial occasions. His sternness to others was that which throughout life he exercised upon himself.

Rome was no favorable school for monastic perfection; yet perhaps the gross and revolting licentiousness of the city, and the abuses in the monastic system, which whether they had penetrated or not into the sanctuary on the Aventine, by exciting the abhorrence of the devout Hildebrand may have hardened his austerity. The alternative to a Roman monk was between shameless profligacy and the extremest rigor, and Hildebrand would not be outdone in the holier course. But arrived at manhood, he determined to seek some better school for his ardent devotion, and to suppress, by travel and by study in some more safe retreat, the yet mutinous passions of his adolescence. There were still, in the general degeneracy of the monastic institutes, some renowned for their sanctity. At no period have been wanting men, who carried out to the utmost, who aimed at surpassing, the severe rules of Benedict or Columban. Among these was Odilo, abbot of Clugny, in Burgundy, the great Reformer of the monastic life in France. The ^{Hildebrand} situation of this monastery was beautiful. ^{in Clugny}

Hildebrand here found a retreat among brethren, whose asceticism might test his most rigorous power of self-discipline. The studies which he had commenced with promising success at Rome, proceeded rapidly in the peaceful shades of Clugny. Hildebrand soon became master of all the knowledge of the times ; and, perhaps at no period was in greater danger of abandoning the lofty destiny for which he seemed born. Where there was such depth of devotion there must have been strong temptation to remain, and to permit that devotion to luxuriate undisturbed and uninterrupted. Hildebrand might have been content to live and die the successor of Odilo of Clugny, not of the long line of Roman Pontiffs.

But holy retirement was not the vocation of his busy and energetic spirit. Hildebrand is again in Rome ; he is attached to that one of three conflicting Popes, whose cause would doubtless have been espoused by a man of devout feeling, and rigidly attached to canonical order. When Gregory VI., compelled to abdicate the
A.D. 1047. Papacy, retired into Germany, he was followed by Hildebrand ; on Gregory's death Hildebrand returned for a short time to his beloved retreat at Clugny.

But during all this period, as a resident in France and in Germany, he was acquiring that knowledge of men and of affairs, which he was hereafter to employ in his great scheme of dominant churchmanship. It was the Italian and the Churchman surveying the weakness of the enemy's position. From Clugny he emerged,
A.D. 1048. having cast his spell on the congenial mind of Leo IX., and admonished him to maintain the dignity and independence of the Papal election. From this

time he was Pope, or becoming so. On every great occasion he was the legate: he was commissioned to encounter and suppress the daring Berengar; he was, no doubt, the adviser of Nicolas II. in the change of the Roman policy, the assumption of the power of election by the Cardinals, and the Norman alliance. He created Alexander II., and discomfited his rival, Cadalous. The strongest indication, indeed, of his superiority, his prophetic consciousness of his own coming greatness, was the self-command with which he controlled his own ambition. There was no eager or premature struggle for advancement; offices, honors, laid themselves at his feet. He was content to labor in a subordinate capacity, to have the substance without the pomp of authority, the influence without the dignity of the Papal power. For a long period in the Papal annals, Hildebrand alone seems permanent. Pope after Pope dies, disappears; Hildebrand still stands unmoved, or is rising more and more to eminence. The Italian might even seem to trust, not without stern satisfaction, to the fatal climate of his country, to wear out the rapid succession of German pontiffs, who yet were rendering the great service of regenerating the Popedom. One by one they fall off, Clement, Damasus, Leo, Victor, Nicolas. The only one who rules for ten years is the Italian, Alexander II.

While Hildebrand was thus rising to the height of power, and becoming more and more immersed in the affairs of the world, which he was to rule, his Damiani, aged colleague in one of his important missions, the suppression of the married clergy in Lombardy, Peter Damiani beheld his progress with amazement, with friendly terror and regret. The similitude and contrast

between these two men is truly characteristic of the age. Damiani was still a monk at heart ; he had been compelled by Pope Stephen, his persecutor, as he called him, rather than his patron, to take upon him the episcopate. He had been invested by the same gentle violence in the rank of a Cardinal ; and in that character had wrought his temporary triumph in Milan. Already had he addressed an earnest argument to Pope Nicolas II., to be allowed to abdicate the weary, unthankful, unmonastic office. Damiani saw the monk, in all but its personal austerity, departing from the character of Hildebrand. Hildebrand could not comprehend the pusillanimity, and, as it were, spiritual selfishness with which Damiani, in anxious apprehension for his own soul, would withdraw from the world, which himself would confront and cope with, not seek his safety in cowardly flight. Damiani trembled even for the stern virtue of Hildebrand, when raised to the pomp, and at least able to command the luxuries of a magnificent prelate. His argument is a bitter satire against the Bishops, and, of course, the still loftier dignitaries of the Church. "What would the bishops of old have done, had they to endure the torments which now attend the episcopate ? To ride forth constantly attended by troops of soldiers, with swords and lances ; to be girt about with armed men, like a heathen general ! Not amid the gentle music of hymns, but the din and clash of arms ! Every day royal banquets, every day parade ! The table, loaded with delicacies, not for the poor, but for voluptuous guests ; while the poor, to whom the property of right belongs, are shut out, and pine away with famine."¹

¹ In one passage Damiani declares no single clerk fit to be a bishop ; one

From that time Gregory and Damiani trod their opposite paths: Damiani to subdue the world within himself¹ with more utter aversion, more concentrated determination; Hildebrand to subdue the world without — how far within his own heart God alone may judge.

The first, the avowed object of Gregory's pontificate, was the absolute independence of the clergy, of the Pope, of the great prelates throughout Latin Christendom, down to the lowest functionary, whose person was to become sacred; that independence under which lurked the undisguised pretension to superiority. Views of
Hildebrand. His remote and somewhat more indistinct vision, was the foundation of a vast spiritual autocracy in the person of the Pope, who was to rule mankind by the consentient, but subordinate authority of the clergy throughout the world. For this end the clergy were to become still more completely a separate, inviolable caste; their property equally sacred with their persons. Each in his separate sphere, the Pope above all and comprehending all, was to be sovereign arbiter of all disputes; to hold in his hands the supreme mediation in questions of war and peace; to adjudge contested successions to kingdoms; to be a great feudal lord, to whom other kings became Beneficiaries. His own arms were to be chiefly spiritual, but the temporal power was to be always ready to execute the ecclesiastical behest against the ungodly rebels who might revolt from its authority; nor did the Churchman refuse altogether to use secular

is a little better (*meliusculum*) than another. The Bishop of Fano he calls "*latro Fanensis*." — *Opuscul.*

¹ See Damiani's black account of the sins which he had to struggle against. Those which clung to him were scurrility (Damiani was not wanting in self-knowledge) and *disposition to laughter*. — *Epist.* v. 2.

weapons, to employ armies in its own name, or even to permit the use of arms to the priesthood.

For this complete isolation of the hierarchy into a peculiar and inviolable caste was first necessary the reformation of the clergy in two most important preliminary matters; the absolute extirpation of the two evils, which the more rigid churchmen had been denouncing for centuries, to the suppression of which Hildebrand had devoted so much of his active energies. The war against simony and the concubinage of the clergy (for under this ill-sounding name was condemned all connection, however legalized, with the female sex), must first be carried to a triumphant issue, before the Church could assume its full and uncontested domination.

Like his predecessors, like all the more high-minded Churchmen, Hildebrand refused to see that simony was the inevitable consequence of the inordinate wealth of the clergy. It was a wild moral paradox to attempt to reconcile enormous temporal possessions and enormous temporal power, with the extinction of all temporal motives for obtaining, all temptations to the misuse of, these all-envied treasures. Religion might at first beguile itself into rapacity, on account of the sacred and beneficent uses to which it designed to devote wealth and power. Works of piety and charity might, for a short time, with the sacred few, be the sole contemplated, sole sought object. But rapacity would soon throw off the mask and assume its real character. Personal passions and desires would intrude into the holiest sanctuary. Pious works would become secondary, subordinate, till at last they would vanish from the view, ambition, avarice, pride, prodigality, luxury, would, by

degrees, supplant those rare and singular virtues. The clergy had too much power over public opinion themselves to submit to its control; they awed mankind — were under awe to none. In the feudal system, which had been so long growing up throughout Western Europe, bishops had become, in every respect, the equals of the secular nobles. In every city the bishop, if not the very first of men, was on a level with the first: without the city he was lord of the amplest domains. Archbishops almost equalled kings; for who would not have coveted the station and authority of a Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, rather than that of the feeble Carolingian monarch? The citizen might well be jealous of the superior opulence and influence of the priest; even the rustic, the serf, might behold, not without envy, his son or his brother (for from this sacerdotal caste there was no absolute exclusion either in theory or practice of the meanest) enjoying the security, the immunities, the respect paid even to the most humble orders of the clergy. And so it was throughout the whole framework of society. But if this was the nobler part of the democratic constitution of the Church, that it was a caste not of birth or race, it had its countervailing evils. There was a constant temptation; a temptation growing in proportion to its privileges and immunities; a temptation which overleaped, or trampled down every barrier, to enter the Church from unhallowed motives. The few who assumed the sacred office from high and pure and perfectly religious views, became comparatively fewer. Men crowded into it from all quarters, and seized at once on its highest and its almost menial offices. That which had been obtained by unworthy means, or for

unworthy motives, would be employed for no higher ends. We have seen the Barbarians forcing their way into the sacred ranks, and bringing with them much of their barbarity. Charlemagne himself had set the example of advancing his natural sons to high ecclesiastical dignities. His feeblers descendants, even the more pious, submitted to the same course from choice or necessity. The evil worked downwards. The Bishop, who had bought his see, indemnified himself by selling the inferior prebends or cures. What was so intrinsically valuable began to have its money-price; it became an object of barter and sale. The layman who purchased holy orders bought usually peace, security of life, comparative ease. Those who aspired to higher dignities soon repaid themselves for the outlay, however large and extortionate. For several centuries, Pope after Pope, Council after Council, had continued to denounce this crime, this almost heresy. The iteration, the gradually increasing terrors of their anathemas, show their inefficacy. While the ambitious churchmen on the one hand were laboring to suppress it, by the still accumulating accessions to their power and wealth they were aggravating the evil. At this period, not merely the indignant satire of the more austere, but graver history and historical poetry, even the acts and decrees of Councils declare that, from the Papacy down to the lowest parochial cure, every spiritual dignity and function was venal. The highest bishops confessed their own guilt; the bishopric of Rome had too often been notoriously bought and sold. Sometimes, indeed, but not always, it condescended to some show of decency. Simony might veil itself under the appearance of ordinary and ancient usage. The universal feudal practice

of making offerings to the sovereign, or to the liege lord, or even largesses to the people, at every act of promotion, grant, or enfranchisement, might seem to justify these donations, at first honorary and voluntary, at length exacted as a tribute, with unscrupulous rapacity. With this was connected the whole famous question of investiture.

But however disguised, simony from its odious name was acknowledged to be a crime and a sin.¹ It undermined the power and authority of the clergy. The priest or bishop laboring under this imputation was held up, by the decrees of Popes and Councils, as an object of hatred and contempt, rather than of respect. But beyond this the vast possessions which tempted to simony were endangered by its inevitable consequences. While the clergy were constantly working on the fears of men to increase their own wealth, the only reprisal in the power of the laity was through the venality of the clergy. It was their only means of rescuing some part of their property from the all absorbing cupidity of those who made it their duty to secure, in theory for God and for pious uses, but too often for other ends, very large proportions of the land throughout Latin Christendom. According to the strict law, the clergy could receive every thing, alienate nothing. But the frequent and bitter complaints of the violent usurpation, or the fraudulent alienation by the clergy themselves,

¹ Tedaldo, Bishop of Arezzo, so detested simony, that he would have become a simoniac Pope himself to root out the sin; at least, so says Donizo the panegyrist of the Countess Matilda:—

“Ipsos detestans dicebat mente modesta
Mille libras certè pro Papatu dare vellem.
Ut quod ego glisco simoniacos maledictos
Ejicerem cunctos per totum denique mundum.”—l. 5.

of what had been church property, show that neither party respected this sanctity when it was the interest of both to violate it.¹ While, on the one hand, the clergy extorted from the dying prince or noble some important grant, immunity or possession, the despoiled heir would scruple at no means of resuming his alienated rights or property. The careless, the profligate, the venal, the warlike bishop or abbot, would find means, if he found advantage, to elude the law ; to surrender gradually and imperceptibly ; to lease out the land so as to annihilate its value to the Church ; to grant in perpetuity for trifling compensations or for valueless service, the coveted estate ; and so to relax the inexorable grasp of the Church. His own pomp and expenditure would reduce the ecclesiastic to the wants and subterfuges of debtors and of bankrupts ; and so the estates would, directly or circuitously, return either to the original or to some new owner.

With this universal simony was connected, more closely than may at first appear, the other great vice of the age, as it was esteemed by Hildebrand and his school, the marriage of the clergy. Few of these men, actuated only by religious motives, by the stern, dominant spirit of monasticism in their refusal of this indulgence to religious men, may have had the sagacity to discern the real danger arising to their power from this practice. The celibacy of the clergy was necessary to their existence, at the present period as a separate

¹ Muratori describes well this struggle: "*Metebant jugi labore in sæcularium campis clerici, ac præcipue monachi; vicissim vero et sæculares nihil intentatum relinquebant, ut messem ab ecclesiasticis congestam, in horrea sua leviori interdum negotio deducerent. Propterea quamvis universam pene tellurem absorbere posse ac velle videretur cleri utriusque industria, plura sacris locis erepta quam relicta fuisse.*" — *Ant. It. Diss.* lxxxii.

caste. The clergy, in an advanced period of civilization, may sink into ordinary citizens; they may become a class of men discharging the common functions of life, only under a stronger restraint of character and of public opinion. As examples of the domestic, as of the other virtues; as training up families in sound morals and religion, they are of inappreciable advantage; they are a living remonstrance and protest against that licentiousness of manners which is the common evil of more refined society. But the clergy of this age, necessarily a caste, would have degenerated from an open, unexclusive caste, to a close and hereditary one.¹ Under the feudal system, every thing, from the throne to the meanest trade, had a hereditary tendency. The benefices, originally revocable at the will of the liege lord, were becoming patrimonies; rank, station, distinction, descended from father to son: the guilds, if they were beginning to be formed in towns, were likewise hereditary. The son followed the trade, and succeeded to the tools, the skill of his parent. But hereditary succession once introduced into the Church, the degeneracy of the order was inevitable; the title to its high places, at least, and its emoluments, would have become more and more exclusive: her great men would cease to rise from all ranks and all quarters.²

¹ See in Damiani a frightful story of a bishop in Marsia, who had a son by a concubine, whom he substituted for himself in his bishopric. He himself coveted the monastery of Casino, hired assassins to pluck out the abbot's eyes, and send the reeking proofs of the murder to him. He died, however, suddenly, at the moment that the abbot was being blinded. True or false, Damiani believed the story. — Epist. iv. 8.

² "*Ampla itaque prædia, ampla patrimonía, et quæcunque bona possunt, de bonis ecclesiæ, neque enim aliunde habent, infames patres infamibus filiis acquirunt. Et ut liberi non per rapinam appareant, volunt enim in terrâ rapere libertatem, ut diabolus in cælo voluit deitatem, in militiam eos mox faciunt transire nobilium.*" — Concil. Papiens. A.D. 1022. Mansi, xix.;

Hereditary succession, we have said, and the degeneracy of the order were inseparable. Great as were the evils inevitable from the dominion of the priesthood, if it had become in any degree the privilege of certain families, that evil would have been enormously aggravated; the compensating advantages annulled. Family affections and interests would have been constantly struggling against those of the Church. Selfishness, under its least unamiable form, would have been ever counteracting the lofty and disinterested spirit which still actuated the better Churchmen; one universal nepotism — a nepotism not of kindred but of parentage — would have preyed upon the vital energies of the order. Every irreligious occupant would either have endeavored to alienate to his lay descendants the property of the Church, or bred up his still more degenerate descendants in the certainty of succession to their patrimonial benefice.¹

Pertz, *Leg.* ii. 561. Compare Theiner, i. 457. It was prohibited, but vainly prohibited, to receive the sons of priests into orders. Gerhard, Bishop of Lorch, asks Pope Leo VII. whether it was lawful: the Pope decided that the sons must not bear the sins of their fathers. — Labbe, ix., sub. an. 937. Compare Planck, iii. p. 601.

¹ Ratherius of Verona, a century earlier (he died 974), declaims against this hereditary priesthood. He had already asserted, “*Quam perdita tonsuratorum universitas tota, ut nemo in eis qui non aut adulter aut sit arse-noquita. Adulter enim nobis est, qui contra canones uxorius est.*” He declares that there were priests and deacons not only bigami, but trigami et quadrigami. “*Presbyter vero aut diaconus uxorem legitimam non possit habere. Si filium de ipsâ fornicatione, vel quod pejus est, adulterio, genitum facit presbyterum, ille iterum suum, suum alter iterum; pullulans illud usque in finem sæculi taliter adulterium, cujus est, nisi illius qui illud primitus seminavit? Quocirca monendi et obsecrandi fratres, ut quia prohiberi, pro dolor! a mulieribus valetis nullo modo, filios de vobis generatos dimitteretis saltem esse laicos, filias laicis jungeretis, ut vel in fine saltem vestro terminaretur, et nusquam in finem sæculi duraret adulterium vestrum.*” — *De Nuptu* ejusdam illicito, ap. d’Achery, i. pp. 370, 1. The Synod of Worms thus writes of the object of Hildebrand’s law: “*Causa*

Yet celibacy may be the voluntary self-sacrifice of an individual, it may be maintained for a time by mutual control and awe; by severe discipline; by a strong corporate spirit in a monastic community. But in a low state of morals as to sexual intercourse, in an order recruited from all classes of society, not filled by men of tried and matured religion; in an order crowded by aspirants after its wealth, power, comparative ease, privileges, immunities, public estimation; in an order superior to, or dictating public opinion (if public opinion made itself heard); in a permanent order, in which the degeneracy of one age would go on increasing in the next, till it produced some stern reaction; in an order comparatively idle, without social duties or intellectual pursuits; in an order not secluded in the desert, but officially brought into the closest and most confidential relations as instructors and soldiers of the other sex, it was impossible to maintain real celibacy;¹ and the

legis est, ne ecclesiarum opes collectæ per sacerdotum matrimonia et liberos rursus diffuerent." The same complaints are made in England as late as the reign of Henry II. (Epist. Gul. Folliott, 361-362.). So little effect had the measures of Gregory and his successors, that Folliott excuses Pope Alexander III. for not carrying out the law: "*Si vero prorsus vitium extirpatum non est, id non imputandum sibi sed magis delinquentium multitudini, vixque, vel nunquam, abolende consuetudini.*"—Document Hist. apud Giles, vol. ii. p. 237.

¹ It is impossible entirely to suppress all notice of other evils which arose out of, and could not but arise out of the enforced celibacy of the clergy, a barbarous clergy, an unmarried clergy, not, throughout the order, under the very strong control of a vigilant and fearless public opinion. Damiani's odious book has been already named: its name is enough. Damiani saw not that, by his own measures, he was probably making such a book almost necessary in future times. In the Council of Metz, 898, a stronger prohibition is needed than against wives and concubines. "*Nequaquam in sua domo secum aliquam feminam habeant, nec matrem, nec sororem: sed auferentes omnem occasionem Satane . . .*"—*Can. v.* That of Nantes gives more plainly the cause of the prohibition: "*Quia instigante diabolo, etiam in illis scelus frequenter perpetratum reperitur, aut etiam in pedissequis illorum, scilicet matrem, amitam, sororem.*" *A.D.* 895.

practical alternative lay between secret marriage, concubinage without the form of marriage, or a looser and more corrupting intercourse between the sexes.

Throughout Latin Christendom, throughout the whole spiritual realm of Hildebrand, he could not but know there had been long a deep-murmured, if not an avowed doubt, as to the authority of the prohibitions against the marriage of the clergy; where the dogmatic authority of the Papal canons was not called in question, there was a bold resistance, or a tacit infringement of the law. Italy has been seen in actual, if uncombined, rebellion from Calabria to the Alps. The whole clergy of the kingdom of Naples has appeared, under Married clergy in Italy. Nicolas II., from the highest to the lowest, openly living with their lawful wives. Still earlier, we have seen Leo IX. contesting, and it should seem in vain, this undisguised license in Rome itself.¹ Milan and other Lombard cities, and Florence, had withstood authority, eloquence, popular violence, even the tribunitian fury of ecclesiastical demagogues; they were silenced, but neither convinced nor subdued. The married clergy were still, if for the present cowed, a powerful faction throughout Italy; they were awaiting their time of vengeance.² Ravenna, if she had now

¹ See quotation, vol. iii. p. 302, from Gulielmus Appulus. See pp. 486-510, with quotations from Peter Damiani and the biographer of S. Gualberto.

² The best testimony for the whole of Italy, including Rome (even beyond the declamations of Damiani), is the statement of the more sober Pope Victor in his Dialogues. "Itaque cum vulgus clericorum per viam effrænata licentiæ, nemine prohibente, graderetur, cœperunt ipsi presbyteri et diacones (qui tradita sibi sacramenta Dominica mundo corde castoque corpore tractare debebant), laicorum more uxores susceptosque filios hæredes relinquere. Nonnulli etiam episcoporum, verecundiâ omni contemptâ, cum uxoribus domo simul in unâ habitare. Et hæc pessima et execranda consuetudo intra Urbem maximè pullulabat, unde olim relig-

fallen into comparative obscurity, and was not, as far as appears, so deeply committed in the strife, yet preserved in her annals (perhaps from the days of her Greek Exarchate) the memory of saintly prelates who had asserted the right of marriage.¹ The memory of the married Pope, Hadrian II., was but recent.

In Germany the power and influence of the married clergy will make itself felt, if less openly proclaimed, as a bond of alliance with the Emperor and the Lombard prelates. The famous letter of Ulric, bishop of Augsburg, to Pope Nicolas I.,² had already boldly asserted the Teutonic freedom in this great question. Ulric had urged with great force the moral and scriptural arguments; and sternly contrasted the vices of the unmarried with the virtues of the married clergy. Adelbert, the magnificent Archbishop of Bremen, almost conceded the marriage of the clergy to avoid worse evils; the statesman prevailed

*Married clergy
in Germany.*

ionis norma ab ipso Apostolo Petro ejusque successoribus ubique diffusa processerat." — Max. Biblioth. Patr. xviii. Compare Bonizo apud (Etel. *Rer. Boic. Script.* ii. 799.

¹ Compare Agnelli. *Vit. Pontif. Ravennat.* "Sed querendum nobis est cur iste conjugatus talem egregiam obtinuit sedem. Si intelligatis auctorem Apostolum dicentem, unius uxoris virum, et filios habentem, episcopos ordinari recte providetur, cum et hoc Canones præceperint." — p. 113. Saint Severus was married, when Archbishop of Ravenna, according to a life written about this time. "Sicut enim ciborum edulio non polluitur homo, nisi insidiatrix concupiscentia præcedit, sic quoque legali conjugio non inquinatur Christianus, qui se nullatenus vel virginitatis vel continentiae alligavit" — Compare p. 192, where the example of Peter is alleged. The saint abstained when archbishop. — *Ibid.*, p. 189.

² Apud Eccard, *Hist. Med. Ævi*, ii. p. 26. I see no just grounds to doubt the authenticity of this letter, though it contains a very foolish story. Compare Shroeck, xxii. p. 533. "Quid divinæ maledictioni obligatius, quam cum aliqui eorum episcopi videlicet et archidiaconi ita præcipientes sint in libidinem, ut neque adulteria, neque incestus, neque masculorum, pro pudor! sciant abhorrere concubitus, quod casta clericorum conjugia dicunt fœtere." Some assert this letter to be a forgery of this period.

over the prelate.¹ Gregory himself had to rebuke the Archbishop of Saltzburg for his remissness in not correcting the uncleanness of his clergy (a phrase which may be safely interpreted, not separating them from their wives), the Bishop of Constance for being indulgent to such flagitious courses.²

Among the detested and incorrigible offences which drove Saint Adalbert in indignation from his bishopric of Prague, were the marriage of the clergy, and the polygamy of the laity.³

There is no reason to suppose the marriage of the clergy less common in France, though it had either the good fortune, or the prudence, not to come into such bold and open collision with the stern Reformer. The French councils denounce the crime as frequent, notorious. That of Bourges had threatened to deprive the married priests, deacons, and subdeacons, if they did not give up all connexion with their wives or concubines.⁴ Under Gregory VII. the Bishop of Toul is accused, it is true, by a refractory clerk, of living publicly with a concubine, by whom he had a son.⁵

In Normandy — if there were priests so early of Norman descent — the fierceness of the conqueror, the Teutonic independence; if the priesthood

¹ "Audivimus cum sæpenumero Adelbertus clerum suum de continentia hortaretur, Admoneo vos, inquit, et postulans jubeo, ut pestiferis mulierum vinculis absolvamini, aut si ad hoc non potestis cogi, saltem cum verecundia vinculum matrimonii custodite, secundum illud quod dicitur, Si non castè tamen cautè." — Scolia. in Adam. Brem. iii. 32, apud Lindembrog, p. 41.

² Regest. i. 30, Nov. 15, 1073, and Udalric Bab. apud Eccard. "Quod pœnam libidinis laxaverit, ut qui mulierculis se inquinaverint in flagitiis persisterent." — Dec. 1074.

³ In 990. Cosmas Pragensis, v. S. Adalbert, p. 77.

⁴ Canon. v.

⁵ Regest. ii. 10.

were of the old Frankish race, the long years of anarchy, had broken down or so dissolved all the old bonds of law and order, that even bishops openly lived with their wives, and sate proudly in the midst of their sons and daughters.¹ When Herluin, the founder of the monastery of Bec, betook himself to monastic life, an unmarried priest or bishop was hardly to be found in Normandy. Leo IX., as has been seen, in vain denounced, at his council at Rheims, the martial and married prelates. They gave up reluctantly their arms; nothing would induce them to yield their wives. The Archbishop of Rouen daring, in a public synod, to prohibit under anathema the priests to retain those whom he opprobriously called their concubines, was overwhelmed with a shower of stones, and driven out of the Church.

Among the Anglo-Saxon clergy before Dunstan, marriage was rather the rule, celibacy the exception.² In older Anglo-Saxon Britain monasticism itself had but seldom aspired either to the dreamy quietude of the

¹ "Tunc quippe in Neustriâ post adventum Normannorum, in tantum dissoluta erat castitas clericorum, ut non solum presbyteri sed etiam præsules libere uterentur thoris concubinarum, et palam superbirent multiplici propagine filiorum et filiarum. Tunc ibidem (Remis) generale concilium tenuit (Leo IX.) et inter reliqua ecclesiæ commoda, quæ constituit, presbyteris arma ferre et conjuges habere prohibuit. Exinde consuetudo lethalis paulatim exinaniri cœpit. Arma quidem ferre presbyteri jam patienter desiere; sed a pellicibus adhuc nolunt abstinere, nec pudicitie inservire." — Orderic. Vital., apud Duchesne, p. 372. "Rarus in Normanniâ tunc rectæ tramitis aut index aut præviis erat: sacerdotes et summi pontifices libere conjugati, et arma portantes, ut laici." — Vit. S. Herluin. apud Lanfranc. Oper., p. 263. "Multum contra impudicos presbyteros pro auferendis pellicibus laboravit, a quibus dum in synodo concubinas eis sub anathema prohiberet, lapidibus percussus aufugit, fugiensque ab ecclesiâ, 'Deus, venerunt gentes in hæreditatem tuam,' fortiter clamavit." — Orderic. Vital., A.D. 1069–1079.

² Kemble, ii. pp. 441–471.

East, or the passionate and excessive austerity of the West: it was a religious profession, no more. The monks attached to most of the cathedrals lived under a kind of canonical rule, but were almost universally married. In the richer conventual foundations ruled mostly, as in France, noble and warlike abbots, and noble abbesses; they took no vow of chastity; they married or remained unmarried at their will.¹ The only two true monks were the Benedictines, who had been introduced by Archbishop Wilfrid. They were chiefly in the northern kingdoms, but throughout England these monasteries had been mercilessly wasted by the Danes: a white cowl was as rare as a ghost. When Dunstan began his career there were true monks only at Abingdon and Glastonbury.²

An English historian may be permitted to dwell in England. somewhat more at length on this great question in Anglo-Saxon Britain. A century before Gregory VII., the Primate Odo, and after him Dunstan, had devoted themselves to work that which they too Dunstan. deemed a holy revolution. Dunstan's life was a crusade, a cruel, unrelenting, yet but partially successful crusade against the married clergy, which in truth comprehended the whole secular clergy of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom. Dunstan was, as it were, in a narrower sphere, among a ruder people, a prophetic type and harbinger of Hildebrand. Like Hildebrand,

¹ "Monasteria nempe Angliæ ante Reformationem a Dunstano et Edgardo rege institutam, totidem erant conventus clericorum sæcularium; qui amplissimis possessionibus dotati et certis sibi invicem regulis astricti, officia sua in ecclesiis quotidie frequentarunt; omnibus interim aliorum clericorum privilegiis, atque ipsâ uxores ducendi licentiâ gaudebant." — Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, i. p. 218.

² Theiner, p. 530.

or rather like Damiani doing the work of Hildebrand, in the spirit, not of a rival sovereign, but of an iron-hearted monk, he trampled the royal power under his feet. The scene at the coronation of King Edwy, excepting the horrible cruelties to which it was the prelude, and which belong to a more barbarous race, might seem to prepare mankind for the humiliation of the Emperor Henry at Canosa.

Archbishop Odo was the primary author, Dunstan the agent, in the outrage on the royal authority at the coronation of young Edwy. Odo was a Dane; had been a warrior: in him the conquering Dane and the stern warrior mingled with the imperious churchman.¹ Dunstan not from his infancy, but from his youth, had been self-trained as a monk. In Dunstan were moulded together the asceticism almost of an Eastern anchorite (his cell would hardly give free room for his body, yet his cell was not only his dwelling, it was his workshop and forge), with some of the industry and accomplishments of a Benedictine. He wrought in iron, in ivory, in the precious metals; practised some arts of design; it is said that he copied manuscripts. Odo became Primate of England. Dunstan at first refused a bishopric: he was Abbot of Glastonbury. The admiring, the worshipping monkish biographers of Dunstan, while they have labored to heighten him to the glory of a saint, have unconsciously darkened him into one of the most odious of mankind. Their panegyric and their undesigned calumny must be received with doubt and

¹ Among the constitutions of Archbishop Odo was the emphatic one:—"Ammonemus regem et principes et omnes qui in potestate sunt ut cum magnâ reverentiâ Archiepiscopo et omnibus aliis episcopis obediant."—Const. ii., Wilkins, sub ann. 943. "Nec alicui liceat censum ponere super ecclesiam Dei."

reservation. Among the perpetual miracles with which they have invested his whole career, some are so awkwardly imagined as to suggest to the most candid an inevitable suspicion of fraud.

With them it was holy zeal (and zeal it doubtless was, how far leavened with harshness and pride who shall know?) which sent Dunstan, at the Primate's order, to drag forth the boy monarch of sixteen from the arms of his wife, back into the banquet-hall of his nobles, who were said to have held themselves insulted by his early withdrawal from their boisterous conviviality. The searing the face of the beautiful Elgiva with a red-hot iron, on her return from her exile in all her beauty and influence; the ham-stringing the unhappy woman; the premature death of Edwy, are related, not merely without compassion, but with a kind of savage triumph, by men in whose hearts not only the affections, but the humanity of our nature have been crushed out by their stern discipline.¹

The scene at Calne, when the great question between the monastic and secular clergy, it might almost be said the celibate and married clergy, was on the issue before the great national council; when the whole of the seats filled by the adverse party fell with a crash, and buried many of them in the ruins, was so happily timed, that although it might have been fortuitous (with the monks

¹ Even in our own day the sympathies of such a man as Dr. Lingard are not with the victims, but with the churchmen. He labors to show that Elgiva was not a wife, but a concubine (she was connected probably with Edwy by some remote kindred). He relates as undoubted truth the monstrous charge, adduced by the gross imagination of the monkish party, of the criminal intimacy of the boy with the mother as well as the daughter. Mr. Hallam has weighed and summed up (in one of his *Supplemental Notes*) with his usual rigid candor, all the probabilities — they are hardly more — of this dark transaction.

of course it was providential, miraculous), it is difficult not to remember Dunstan's mastery over all the mechanical skill of the day.¹

But, whatever the apparent triumph of Dunstan and of monasticism, it needed all the power of Odo the Primate, all the commanding perseverance of Dunstan, when the King Edgar, who now held the throne, became the slave of their will, and the royal laws and royal authority might seem to have no aim but the proscription of the marriage of the clergy² to obtain even transient conformity. It was not by law, but by armed invasion of cathedral after cathedral, that the married clergy were ejected, the Benedictines installed in their places. Twice the seculars had influence enough to prevent the elevation of Dunstan: his pious ambition at last condescended to a bishopric, that of Worcester, then of Worcester and London together, finally to the Primacy. Dunstan welcomed, so said his admirers, by visible angels, died; Dunstan wrought countless miracles at his tomb. Dunstan became a Saint; and yet he A.D. 983. had achieved no permanent victory. Hardly twenty years after the death of Dunstan, a council is held at

¹ "Omnibus ad terram elisis, solus Dunstanus, stans super unam trabem quæ superstes erat, probè evasit." Compare Osbern, in Vit. Dunstani. "Hoc miraculum archiepiscopo exhibuit pacem de clericis, omnibus Anglis tunc et deinceps in sententiam ejus concedentibus." — Gul. Malmesb., p. 258.

² Compare Edgar's Charta de Oswald's Lawe, A. D. 964. "Hoc est de ejiciendis clericis uxoratis et introducendis monachis." — Ap. Harduin, vi. p. 637. Malmesbury writes of Edgar like a true monk. It was a glorious reign of sixteen years. Nec ullus fere annus in chronicis præteritus est, quo non magnum et necessarium patriæ aliquid fecerit, quo non monasticum novum fundaverit. p. 236. — Edit. Hist. Society. See p. 237 on Dunstan, note, and on Dunstan's turning the secular priests of Worcester into regular. Tunc ordo monasticus jamdudum lapsus, præcipue caput erexit. p. 247.

Enham; it declares that there were clergy who had two, even more wives; some had dismissed their wives, and in their lifetime taken others. It might seem that the compulsory breach of the marriage bond had only introduced a looser, promiscuous concubinage; men who strove, or were forced, to obey, returned to their conjugal habits with some new consort.¹

Canute, the Dane, aspired to be a religious monarch; his laws are in the tone of the monastic hierarchy.

After the great revolution, which dispossessed the Saxon clergy of all the higher benefices, the Bishop of Lichfield is accused before the Papal legate, of living in open wedlock and with sons by his wife.² Archbishop Lanfranc is commanded, by Pope Gregory, to prohibit canons from taking wives; and if priests and deacons, to part them immediately from their wives, or to inflict the sentence of deprivation.³

The strife throughout Christendom between the monks and the secular clergy, if it rose not directly out of, was closely connected with, this controversy. In the monks the severer ecclesiastics had sure allies; they were themselves mostly monks: nearly all the great champions of the Church, the more intrepid vindicators of her immunities, the rigid administrators of her laws, were trained in the monasteries for their arduous conflict. It was an arduous, but against the married clergy, an unequal contest. The monastic

Monks and
secular
clergy.

¹ A. D. 1009. In *more* est, ut quidam duas, quidam plures habeant, et nonnullus quamvis eam dimiserit, quam antea habuit, aliam tamen ipsa vivente accipit. This, although "certissime norint quod non debeant habere ob aliquam coitus causam" uxoris consortium, the latter offence is "quod nullus Christianus facere debet." — Mansi, xxi. Wilkins, i. 287.

² Cui uxor publicè habita, filiiq; procreati testimonium perhibent. — Lanfranc. Epist. iv.

³ Regesta, Greg. vii. i. 30.

school were united, determined, under strong convictions, with undoubting confidence in broad and intelligible principles; the married clergy in general doubtful, vacillating, mostly full of misgiving as to the righteousness of their own cause; content with the furtive and permissive license, rather than disposed to claim it boldly as their inalienable right. The former had all the prejudices of centuries in their favor, the greatest names in the Church, long usage, positive laws, decrees of Popes, axioms of the most venerable fathers, some seemingly positive texts of Scripture: the latter only a vague appeal to an earlier antiquity with which they were little acquainted; the true sense of many passages of the sacred writings which had been explained away; a dangerous connection with suspicious or heretical names; the partial sanction of the unauthoritative Greek Church. Their strongest popular ground was the false charge of Manicheism against the adversaries of marriage.

The great strength of the monastic party was in the revival of monasticism itself. This had taken place, more or less, in almost every part of Christendom. The great monasteries had sunk on account of their vast possessions — too tempting to maintain respect — some into patrimonies of noble families — some into appanages, as it were, of the crown. The kings granted them to favorites, not always ecclesiastical favorites. Many were held by lay abbots, who, by degrees, expelled the monks; the cloisters became the camps of their retainers, the stables of their coursers, the kennels of their hounds, the meutes of their hawks. In Germany we have seen the extensive appropriation of the wealthiest monasteries by the lordly prelates. But

even now one of those periodical revolutions had begun, through which monasticism for many ages renewed its youth, either by restoring the discipline and austere devotion within the old convents, or by the institution of new orders, whose emulation always created a strong reaction throughout the world of Monachism. In France, William of Aquitaine, and Bruno of the royal house of Burgundy, began the reform. It had spread from Clugny under Odo and his successors; in Italy from Damiani, and from S. Gualberto in Vallombrosa; Herlembald was still upholding the banner of monkhood in Milan; in England the strong impulse given by Dunstan had not expired. Edward the Confessor, a monk upon the throne, had been not merely the second founder of the great Abbey of Westminster, but had edified and encouraged the monks by his example. Even in Germany a strong monastic party had begun to form: the tyranny and usurpation of the crown and of the great prelates could not but cause a deep, if silent revulsion.

Almost the first public act of Gregory VII. was a declaration of implacable war against these his two mortal enemies, simony and the marriage of the clergy. He was no infant Hercules; but the mature ecclesiastical Hercules would begin his career by strangling these two serpents; the brood, as he esteemed them, and parents of all evil. The decree of the synod held in Rome in the eleventh month of his pontificate is not extant, but in its inexorable provisions it went beyond the sternest of his predecessors. It absolutely invalidated all sacraments performed by simoniacal or married priests: ¹ baptism was

Gregory's
synod at
Rome.

March 9, 10,
1074.

¹ Gregorius Papa celebratâ synodo simoniacos anathematizavit, uxoratos

no regenerating rite ; it might almost seem that the Eucharistic bread and wine in their unhallowed hands refused to be transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ. The communicants guilty of perseverance at least in the sin, shared in the sacerdotal guilt. Even the priesthood were startled at this new and awful doctrine, that the efficacy of the sacraments depended on their own sinlessness. Gregory, in his headstrong zeal, was promulgating a doctrine used afterwards by Wycliffe and his followers with such tremendous energy. And this was a fearless, democratical provocation to the people ; for it left to notoriety, to public fame, to fix on any one the brand of the hidden sin of simony, or (it might be the calumnious) charge of concubinage ; and so abandoned the holy priesthood to the judgment of the multitude.¹

sacerdotes a divinis officio removît, et laicis missam eorum audire interdixit novo exemplo et ut multis visum est inconsiderato præjudicio contra sanctorum patrum sententiam qui scripserunt, quod sacramenta quæ in ecclesiâ fiunt, baptismus videlicet, chrisma, corpus et sanguis Christi, Spiritu sancto latenter operante eorundem sacramentorum effectum seu per bonos, seu per malos intra Dei ecclesiam dispensentur. Tamen quia Spiritus Sanctus mystice illa vivificat, nec meritis bonorum dispensatorum amplificantur, nec peccatis malorum extenuantur. — Sig. Gemblac. ad a. 1074. Matth. Paris sub eod. ann. West. Flor. Hist. ibid.

¹ Floto (ii. pp. 45 et seqq.) has well shown the terrible workings of this appeal to the populace. The peasants held that an *accusation* of simony or marriage exempted them from the payment of tithe. Read the letter of Theodorice of Verdun, Martene, Thes. 1. Compare too the “*de Schismate Ildebrandi*” (see on this book note farther on), in which are some frightful accounts of the ill-usage of the clergy by the rabble. One disgraceful proceeding, not undeserved, had been witnessed at Cremona by the interlocutor. Gregory’s advocate insists that the pope’s churchmanship was grieved and offended at this desecration of the sacerdotal character. Sicut a viris fidelibus didici, qui multa cum illo de talibus contulerunt, referre solitus erat, quod tam crudelia et gravia nunquam in presbyteros fieri mandavisset ; plurimum etiam se dolere solitum, quotiens imperitum vulgus hujusmodi novis injuriis moveretur displicuisse semper verbera sacerdotum, cædes et vincula, cippos et carceres, si forte talia a laicis paterentur. pp. 161, 162.

But the extirpation of these two internal enemies to the dignity and the power of the sacerdotal order was far below the holy ambition of Gregory; this was but clearing the ground for the stately fabric of his Theocracy. If, for his own purposes, he had at first assumed some moderation in his intercourse with the empire, over the rest of Latin Christendom he took at once the tone and language of a sovereign. We must rapidly survey, before we follow him into his great war with the empire, Gregory VII. asserting his autocracy over the rest of Latin Christendom. In the monastery of Clugny, accompanying, or vigilantly watching the German pontiffs in their Transalpine spiritual campaigns, Gregory had taken the measure of the weakness which had fallen on the monarchy of France. The first kings of the house of Capet were rather the heads of a coequal feudal federalty than kings; their personal character had not raised them above their unroyal position. King Robert, the son of Hugh Capet, had abandoned his wife Bertha, to whom he was deeply attached, because the imperious Church had discovered some remote impediment, both of consanguinity and spiritual affinity.¹ He had undergone seven years' penance; the Archbishop of Tours, who had sanctioned the incestuous wedlock, must submit to deposition. But Robert aspired to be, and was, a saint. Leo. IX. had held his council at Rheims in despite of Robert's successor (Henry I.), and compelled the prelates to desert the feudal banner of their king for that of their spiritual liege lord.² Hildebrand's

¹ She was his cousin in the fourth degree; he had been godfather to one of Bertha's children by her former marriage.

² Concil. Rem., A.D. 998.

letters to Philip I., King of France, are in the haughtiest, most criminatory terms. "No king has reached such a height of detestable guilt in oppressing the churches of his kingdom as Philip of France." He puts the King to the test; his immediate admission of a Bishop of Macon, elected by the clergy and people, without payment to the crown. Either let the King repudiate this base traffic of simony, and allow fit persons to be promoted to bishoprics, or the Franks, unless apostates from Christianity, will be struck with the sword of excommunication, and refuse any longer to obey him.¹ In a later epistle to the Bishops of France, describing the enormous wickedness of the land, among other crimes the plunder and imprisonment of pilgrims on their way to Rome, he charges the King, or rather the tyrant of France, as the head and cause of all this guilt. Instead of suppressing, he is the example of all wickedness.² The plunder of all merchants, especially Italians, who visit France, takes place by royal authority. He exhorts the bishops to admonish him, rebukes their cowardly fears and want of dignity; if the King is disobedient, the Pope commands them to excommunicate him, and to suspend all religious services throughout France.³ At one time, in the affair of the Archbishop Manasseh of Rheims, all the Archbishops of France were under excommunication.

Whether as part of the new Roman policy, which looked to the Italian Normans as its body-guard in the approaching contest with the Transalpine

¹ Ad Roderic. Cabillon, i. 35, Dec. 4, 1079.

² Ad Episcop. Franc. ii. 5, Sept. 10, 1074, still stronger, ii. 32, Dec. 8, 1074. Compare Letter to Philip, i. 75, to the Count of Ponthieu ii. 18 Nov. 13 1074.

³ Regest., v. 17.

powers, and therefore would propitiate that brave and rising race throughout the world, Hildebrand's predecessor (and Alexander II. did no momentous act without the counsel of Hildebrand) had given a direct sanction to the Norman Conquest of England.¹ The banner of St. Peter floated in the van of the Bastard at Hastings. The reliques, over which Harold had been betrayed into the oath of abandoning his claims on the throne to William, were ostentatiously displayed. It was with the full papal approbation, or rather with the actual authority of the Pope, that Stigand, the Anglo-Saxon primate was deposed, and the Anglo-Saxon hierarchy ejected from all the higher dignities, the bishoprics and abbacies. A papal bull declared it illegal to elect a Saxon to a high benefice. The holiness of the sainted Confessor was forgotten. The Norman abbey of Bec must furnish primates, the Norman hierarchy prelates, not all of the same high ecclesiastical character as Lanfranc and Anselm, for conquered England.

Hildebrand may have felt some admiration, even awe of the congenial mind of the Conqueror. Yet with England the first intercourse of Gregory was an imperious letter to Archbishop Lanfranc concerning the Abbey of St. Edmondsbury, over which he claimed papal jurisdiction.² To the King his language is courteous. He advances the claim to Peter's pence over the kingdom. William admits this claim : it was among the stipulations, it was the price which the Pope had imposed for his assent to the Conquest. But to the demand of fealty, the Conqueror returns an answer of haughty brevity : " I have not, nor will I swear fealty

¹ Compare Letter to Lanfranc, Regest. v., also on England, viii. 1, ix. 5.

² Alexandri Epist. apud Lanfranc, iv.

which was never sworn by any of my predecessors to yours."¹ And William maintained his Teutonic independence—created bishops and abbots at his will—was absolute lord over his ecclesiastical as over his feudal liegemen.²

To the kings of Spain, in one of his earliest letters, Pope Gregory boldly asserts that the whole ^{Gregory at} realm of Spain is not only within the spiritual ^{Spain.} jurisdiction of the Holy See, but her property; whatever part may be conquered from the usurping infidels may be granted by the Pope, or held by the conquerors as his vassals. He reminds the kings of Spain, Alphonso of Castile, and Sancho of Arragon, of the ancient obedience of Spain to the Apostolic See, and exhorts them not to receive the services of Toledo, but that of Rome.³

No part of Latin Christendom was so remote or so barbarous as to escape his vigilant determination to bring it under his vast ecclesiastical unity.⁴ While yet a deacon he had corresponded with Sweyn, king of Denmark; on him he bestows much grave and excellent advice. In a letter to Olaf, king of Norway, he dissuades him solemnly from assisting the rebellious brothers of the Danish king.⁵

¹ Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo, quia nec ego promisi, nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio. — Lanfranc. Oper. Epist. x.

² William's temper in such matters was known. An abbot of Evreux went to complain at Rome. William said, "I have a great respect for the Pope's Legate in things which concern religion. Mais, ajouta-t-il, si un moine de mes terres osait porter plainte contre moi, je le ferai pendre à l'arbre le plus élevé de la forêt." — Depping, Hist. des Normands, p. 350.

³ Regest., i. 7, April 30, 1073, regnum Hispaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuisse. He appeals to a legend of St. Paul having sent seven bishops from Rome to convert Spain, i. 64, March 19, 1074. Compare iv. 28.

⁴ Regest., ii. 51.

⁵ vi. 13

Between the Duke of Poland and the King of the Russians he interposes his mediation. The son of the Russian had come to Rome to receive his kingdom from the hands of St. Peter.¹

The kingdom of Hungary, as that of Spain, he treats Oct. 23, 1074. as a fief of the papacy; he rebukes the King Solomon for daring to hold it as a benefice of the king of the Germans.²

He watches over Bohemia; his legates take under Jan. 31, 1074. their care the estates of the Church; he summons the Archbishop of Prague to Rome.³

Even Africa is not beyond the care of Hildebrand.⁴ The clergy and people of Carthage are urged to adhere to their archbishop — not to dread the arms of the Saracens, though that once flourishing Christian province, the land of Cyprian and Augustine, is so utterly reduced, that three bishops cannot be found to proceed to a legitimate consecration.⁵

¹ Regest., ii. 73, 74, April 20, 1075.

² Regnum Hungariæ sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ proprium est, ii. 13; compare ii. 63 (March 23, 1075), Geusæ. R. H., consanguineus tuus (Solomon) a rege Teutonico non a Romano pontifice, usurpative obtinuit dominium ejus, ut credimus, divinum judicium impedivit.

³ i. 45.

⁴ i. 23.

⁵ Regest., iii. 19, June, 1076. Compare a remarkable letter to Abazir, King of Mauritania, iii. 21.

CHAPTER II.

KING HENRY IV. CANOSA.

BUT the Empire was the one worthy, one formidable antagonist to Hildebrand's universal theocracy, ^{Gregory and the Empire.} whose prostration would lay the world beneath his feet. The Empire must acknowledge itself as a grant from the papacy, as a grant revocable for certain offences against the ecclesiastical rights and immunities ; it must humbly acquiesce in the uncontrolled prerogative of the Cardinals to elect the Pope ; abandon all the imperial claims on the investiture of the prelates and other clergy with their benefices ; release the whole mass of Church property from all feudal demands, whether of service or of fealty ; submit patiently to rebuke ; admit the Pope to dictate on questions of war and peace, and all internal government where he might detect, or suppose that he detected, oppression. This was the condition to which the words and acts of Gregory aspired to reduce the heirs of Charlemagne, the successors of the Western Cæsars.

These two powers, the Empire and the Papacy, had grown up with indefinite and necessarily conflicting relations ; each at once above and beneath the other ; each sovereign and subject, with no distinct limits of sovereignty or subjection ; each acknowledging the supremacy of the other, but each re-

The Papacy
and the
Empire.

ducing that supremacy to a name, or less than a name. As a Christian, as a member of the Church, the Emperor was confessedly subordinate to the Pope, the acknowledged head and ruler of the Church.¹ As a subject of the Empire, the Pope owed temporal allegiance to the Emperor. The authority of each depended on loose and flexible tradition, on variable and contradictory precedents, on titles of uncertain signification, Head of the Church, Vicar of Christ; Patrician, King of Italy, Emperor; each could ascend to a time when they were separate and not dependent upon each other. The Emperor boasted himself the successor to the whole autocracy of the Cæsars, to Augustus, Constantine, Charlemagne: the Pope to that of St. Peter, or of Christ himself. On the other hand, when the Emperor claimed the right of nominating and electing the Pope, he could advance long, recent, almost unbroken precedent. The Pope, nevertheless, could throw himself still further back on his original independent authority, to the early times of the Church before the conversion of Constantine, and to the subsequent period before the election of the Pope had become of so much importance as to demand the constant supervision of the civil power; above all, to the nature of that power, of divine not of human institution. Besides, on their part, Charlemagne no doubt, and his Transalpine successors, had received both the Patriciate and the Imperial crown, if not as a gift, yet from the hands of the Popes, and had been consecrated by them; and so, if the imperial authority was not conferred, it was hal-

¹ Even Henry IV., perhaps in his despair, admitted that he might justly be deposed if he had abandoned the faith. — Henric. Epist. ad Pap. This was after the Council of Worms.

lowed and endowed with a stronger title to Christian obedience by that almost indispensable ceremony. Yet the power of the Cæsars mounted far higher, to the times when they were the sole autocratic representatives of all-ruling Rome; Cæsars to whom the Apostles themselves had paid loyal, conscientious obedience. Nero had been the higher power to whom Paul had enjoined subjection; and the temporal power itself, so said the Scripture in words of emphatic distinctness, was likewise of divine appointment. The agency of either being requisite to complete and ratify the power of the other, the popular conception would construe that consent, concurrence, or approval, into an act of free will, therefore of superiority. The perplexity would be without end; perplexity from which men would escape only by closing their eyes, and choosing their course in the blindness of desperate partisanship. The loftiest minds might espouse either side on a great immutable principle; each cause became a religion. Nor would either Pope or Emperor be without precedent or groundwork in the theory of his power, if he claimed, as each did, the right of acting towards his adversary as a rebel, and of deposing that rebel; the Emperor the right of appointing an Anti-pope, the Pope of setting up a rival Emperor.¹

The strife, therefore, might seem at once internecine and interminable; and in this mortal warfare the powers, which each commanded, were strangely coun-

¹ *Dixerat enim ille Sarabaita* (this was an opprobrious term for Pope Gregory) *quod in suâ esset potestate, quem vellet ad imperium promovere, et quem vellet removere. Sed arguitur fœditatis testimonio libri pontificalis. Ibi enim legitur, quod ordinatio papæ atque episcoporum sit, et esse debet, per manus regum et imperatorum.* This declaration of Henry's panegyrist, Benzo (p. 1060), is fully confirmed by Gregory's acts and words.

terbalanced ; though in this age the advantage was on the side of the Pope. The Emperor might seem to wield the whole force of the Empire, to command an irresistible army ; the German soldiers were a terror to the Italians ; often had they marched, without encountering a foe, upon Rome itself. The Pope, on the other hand, was a defenceless prelate, by his character prohibited from bearing arms, without military force, without a defensible territory, with no allies on whom he could depend. Yet the Pope had no scruple in waging war by secular arms. War for the aggrandizement of the Church had no horrors for the vicegerent of Christ. Neither Gregory nor his successors, nor did the powerful Churchmen in other parts of the world, hesitate to employ, even to wield, the iron arms of knights and soldiery for spiritual purposes, as they did not to use spiritual arms for ends strictly secular. They put down ecclesiastical delinquents by force of arms ; they anathematized their political enemies. The sword of St. Peter was called in to aid the keys of St. Peter. Leo IX. had set the example of a military campaign against the Normans ; but these were thought at that time scarcely better than infidels. Neither the present nor the succeeding age would have been greatly shocked at the sight of a Pope, in complete armor, at the head of a crusade.¹ Nor were allies wanting to counterbalance the armies of the Empire. The policy of Pope Nicolas had attached the Normans to the Roman cause ; Gregory at one time had rashly cast off the Norman alliance ;

¹ Gregory decides the cases in which a priest may bear arms. He is condemned (si) arma militaria portaverit, excepto si pro tuendâ justitiâ suâ vel domini, vel amici, seu etiam pauperum, nec non pro defendendis ecclesiis. — Ad Britann., vii. 10.

but he was strong in that of the house of Tuscany. The Countess Beatrice, and her daughter Matilda, were his unshaken adherents. But the great power of each lay in the heart of his adversary's territory. In Rome the Counts of Tusculum and the neighboring barons were dangerous partisans of the Empire, because enemies of the Pope. At scarcely any period was the Emperor undisputed Lord of Germany. Unwilling, if not rebellious subjects, princes, often as powerful as himself, were either in arms, or watching a favorable opportunity for revolt. Usually there was some ambitious house waiting its time to raise itself upon the ruins of the ruling dynasty. Nor was the Church more united than the Empire. If many of the great ecclesiastics of the Empire, from Churchmanship, from religious fear, or jealousy of the temporal power, maintained the Papal cause beyond the Alps, the Emperor was rarely without powerful prelates on his side, even in Italy. But though thus in some degree thwarted and opposed, even by his natural subjects, the spiritual power of the Pope was of tremendous efficacy. The anathema, which in its theory at least, and in its unmitigated language, devoted its victim to eternal death, had hardly lost any of its terrors. In the popular belief, and that popular belief included the highest as well as the lowest, the actual doom of each man depended on the award of the clergy, that of nations on the supreme fiat of the Pope. The necessities of religious guidance and direction were far more deeply felt than those of temporal government. The world could do better without a Cæsar than without a Pope — at least without a priesthood, who at once, at the word of the Pope, suspended all their blessed offices. Without the Sacra-

ments salvation was impossible ; and these Sacraments ceased at once. If baptism was granted to infants, if to the dying the Eucharist was not absolutely denied ; yet even these were conceded only as acts of mercy, and on ample submission : to the excommunicated they were utterly, absolutely refused.

Anathema became, without shaking the common dread of its effects, the ordinary weapon employed by the Pope in his quarrels ; by Hildebrand it was fulminated with all the energy of his character. The more religious, indeed, had been for some time shocked at the lavish frequency with which this last extremity of punishment was inflicted, even on refractory bishops, and for ecclesiastical offences.¹ There might be some prudent apprehension lest it should lose its force by familiarity. But Damiani argues against it on the high religious ground of the utter disproportion of the punishment in many cases to the offence of the criminal. But it had long ceased to be confined to delinquencies against the faith or the practice of the Gospel.² A new class of crimes was gradually formed — disobedience to the clergy or the See of Rome in matters purely secu-

¹ Damiani remonstrates against the perpetual affixture of the anathema to all Papal, almost to all ecclesiastical decrees. He is afraid of impairing its solemnity: he would reserve it for more awful crimes, such as heresy. A man may almost inadvertently rush "in æternæ mortis barathrum," find himself, for some trivial offence, the consort of heretics — continuo velut hæreticus et tanquam cunctis criminibus teneatur obnoxius, anathematis sententiâ condemnatur. — Epist. 1, xii., ad Alexas. Pap. Damiani has no doubt that the anathema eternally damns its victims! — Epist. 1, vii. and xiv.

² Anathema even aspired to temporal effects. Festinabimus a communione Christianæ societatis abscindere, ita ut nullam deinceps victoriam in bello, nullam prosperitatem habere possit in sæculo. — Ad Berengar, vi. 16. How, in a warlike and superstitious age, must this terrible omen have worked its own fulfilment!

lar ; encroachment, real or supposed, upon the property of the Church ; the assertion of rights questioned by the Church ; the withholding immunities claimed by the Church. It was not as infringing the doctrines of Christ as an infidel, or as a heretic ; it was not as violating the great moral law of Christ, not as a murderer or an adulterer, that the baron, the King, or the Emperor in general incurred the Papal ban and was thereby excluded from the communion of the faithful and from everlasting salvation ; it was as a contumacious subject of the worldly kingdom of the Supreme Pontiff.¹ Even where moral or spiritual offences were mingled up with the general charge, that of contumacy to the ecclesiastical superior was placed in the same rank, and to the common feelings of mankind was the real, if not avowed, ground of the censure.

But not only was the excommunicated himself under this awful condemnation, the ban comprehended all who communicated with excommunicated persons. Every one in the councils, every one in the army, every one who obeyed, almost every subject who rendered allegiance to an excommunicated prince, was virtually under excommunication ; and under the weight of this censure, with this aggravation of death before their eyes, men were to go forth to battle against those who proclaimed themselves the champions of the Church, the armies of the faith. To these, if immediate transition from the battle-field to paradise was not explicitly

¹ The Norman princes, to whom the Pope had granted their great possessions and privileges, and on whom the Papacy had for some time relied for its defence against the barons of the Campagna, having given offence, and Hildebrand being secure in the more powerful protection of Beatrice of Tuscany and her daughter, were excommunicated by the dauntless Pope.

promised, as afterwards to the crusaders in the Holy Land (Mohammedan rewards calculated to animate them against Mohammedan foes), yet they fought under consecrated banners; their heroes were compared with those of the Old Testament; the grateful Church, the dispenser of everlasting life and death, would not forget their services; St. Peter would recognize the faithful servants of his successor; their religious courage could not but rise to fanaticism; they were warring for the saints of God — for God himself.¹

But if on this broad and general view the Pope stood thus on the vantage ground in his contest with the Emperor, never was a time in which the adversaries met on more unequal terms; the Papacy in the fulness of its strength, the Empire at the lowest state of weakness. The Pope, Hildebrand, mature in age, of undisputed title, with a name which imposed awe throughout Latin Christendom, and with the unswerving conviction that, in raising the Papal power to the utmost, he was advancing the glory of God; perhaps, if he stooped to think

¹ Compare the elaborate argument of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, in favor of waging war against the adherents of Guibert the Antipope. After reciting all the soldiers named with honor in the New Testament, he goes on to infer that if it is lawful ever to wage war, it is against heretics. Did not S. Hilary arm King Clovis against the Arians? Did not S. Augustine urge Count Boniface to hang and every way to persecute the Donatists and Circumcellions? Did not Augustine, in his Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount on the text, "Blessed are ye who suffer persecution for righteousness sake," say that those are equally blessed who *inflict persecution* for the sake of righteousness! He quotes Jerome as saying, *non est impietas pro Deo crudelitas* (ad Rustic. Narbon). "Hear the teaching of the Fathers, look to the example of those who have fought for the truth!" He then triumphantly appeals to the burning of Hermogenes, the Prefect, at Constantinople, by the orthodox, the battles waged by the Alexandrians against the Arians, which are "praised throughout the world." He concludes with Cyril's sanctification of the monk Ammonius, who had attempted the life of the Prefect Orestes, as a martyr: he ends with the example of Pope Leo and of Herlembald of Milan.

on such subjects, the welfare of mankind. The Emperor, a youth, with all the disadvantages of youth, the passions and weaknesses of a boy Character of Henry IV. born to Empire, but with none of that adventitious and romantic interest which might attach the generous to his cause. He had been educated, if education it might be called, by a gentle and tender mother, by imperious Churchmen who had galled him with all that was humiliating with none of the beneficial effects of severe control.¹ They had only been indulgent to his amusements; they had not trained him to the duties of his station, or the knowledge of affairs and of man. In his earliest youth, thus altogether undisciplined, he had been compelled to contract a marriage for which he felt profound aversion; and the stern Churchmen, who had bound this burden upon him, refused to release him.² He tried to bribe Siegfried of Mentz to sanction the divorce, by promising his aid in despoiling the abbots of Fulda and Herzfeld of the tithes of Thuringia,³ but the Pope sent the stern Peter Damiani to forbid the evil example. "Well then," said Henry, "I will 1069. bear the burden which I cannot throw off." And when, no doubt in consequence, he plunged with reckless impetuosity into the licentiousness which his station could command, this, unexcused, unpalliated, was turned to

¹ Stenzel, i. p. 249, has justly described the character of Henry and the evil influences of the domination of this ambitious, rapacious, and unprincipled hierarchy. The great German ecclesiastics abandoned him to himself where they should have controlled, controlled where they should have left him free. It might almost seem that they had studied to shear him of all his strength before he should be committed in his strife with Hildebrand.

² *Quam suasionibus principum invitatus duxerat.* Bruno de Bello Saxonico, p. 176. He was but ten years old when he was forced to marry her: bad never known her, as he declared.

³ Compare Stenzel, 254.

his shame and discredit by his inexorable adversaries. At length, indeed, his generous nature revolted at his ill-treatment of a gentle and patient wife. She bore A.D. 1071. him a son. From that time he was deeply attached to her. She was his faithful companion in all his trials and sorrows; she gave him four children. Thus with all the lofty titles, the pomp without the power, the burden with nothing but the enervating luxuries, none of the lofty self-confidence of one born and fitly trained to Empire, the character of Henry was still further debased by the shame of perpetual defeat and humiliation. His greater qualities, till they were forced out by adversity, his high abilities, till gradually ripened by use and experience, were equally unsuspected by his partisans and by his enemies.

The great contest of Henry's reign found the Emperor with no part of his subjects attached to his person, with but few regarding the dignity of the Empire irrespective of their own private interests, and with the most powerful and warlike in actual rebellion. The day after the inauguration of Pope Gregory the Saxon princes met, and determined on their revolt. Nothing can show more clearly the strange confusion of civil and religious matters than the course of proceedings during this conflict. The Saxon insurrection takes the character of a religious war. The confederates first named by the historian are Wenzel Archbishop of Magdeburg, Burchard Bishop of Halberstadt, the Bishops of Hildesheim, Merseburg, Minden, Paderborn, and Meissen. The three ecclesiastics favorable to the cause of Henry, Licmar Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Zeitz and Osnaburg, are obliged to fly the country. To the first

Saxon revolt
against
Henry.

June 29, 30,
1073.

imperative demand, the demolition of the castles which Henry had built on many of the hills and mountain fastnesses, to control these turbulent Saxon chieftains, they added these terms; — that he should dismiss his favorites, and commit the administration of affairs to his legitimate counsellors, the princes of the Empire; that he should disperse the bevy of concubines which he maintained, contrary to decency and to the canons of the Church, and reinstate his lawful wife in his bed and in his affections; and so altogether abandon the follies of his youth. “If he refused their just demands, they were Christians, and would not be defiled by communion with a man who insulted the Christian faith through such wickedness. They were bound by an oath of allegiance; and if he would rule for the edification, not the destruction of the Church, justly and according to ancient usage, maintain inviolate the law, rights, and liberties of all, their oath was valid; but if he first broke his oath they were absolved from theirs; they would wage war upon him, even to death, as a Barbarian, and as an enemy of the Christian name, for the Church of God, the faith of Christ, and their own liberties.” It was well for Henry that this first Saxon revolt was quelled before the breaking out of direct hostilities with Gregory; for if his insurgent subjects could issue a manifesto so bold, and in some respects so noble, what had been the consequence if the Pope had supported their demands? Thuringia,¹ as well as Saxony, was in arms, and Henry received his first bitter if instructive lesson of humiliation. His revolted subjects had openly avowed the right of deposing him. “So

¹ A dispute concerning the tithes of that whole region, claimed and levied by the Archbishop of Mentz, was involved in the rebellion of Thuringia.

great was his wickedness, that he ought not only to abdicate his throne, but be stripped of his military belt, and for his sins forswear the world.”¹ He had been publicly accused by Reginer, a noble of high character, of conspiring basely to massacre the princes of the Empire; and the challenge of Reginer to make good his charge in single combat had been eluded rather than cheerfully accepted in bold defiance of its injustice. Henry, unequal to these adversaries, had been reduced to the utmost poverty, to abject flight and concealment. One city alone, Worms, adhered to the Emperor’s waning fortune, and gave time for the formidable league to fall asunder. Henry found that there was still power in the name of the King and Emperor; many of the princes on the Rhine, with the great prelates, rallied around the sovereign; the battle of Hohenburg broke the Saxon power; the principal insurgents had been betrayed into his hands for Henry scrupled not at perfidy to regain his authority.

Till the close of this Saxon war the Pope had maintained a stately neutrality; events had followed so rapidly, that even had he been disposed, he could scarcely have found time for authoritative interposition. The first overt act of Hildebrand relating to the Emperor,² had been a general admonition

Neutrality of
the Pope.

¹ Militare cingulum et omnem prorsus sæculi usum quanto magis regnum abdicare. The Saxons fought pro ecclesiâ Dei, pro fide Christianorum, pro libertate suâ, p. 197. — Lambert of Herzfeld. See on Lambert of Herzfeld, improperly called of Aschaffenburg, the Preface of Pertz. It is fortunate that, for these critical times, we have perhaps the best of the monastic historians — he is our chief authority — with the “De Bello Saxonico” of Bruno, and Berthold. Floto’s Heinrich IV. und seine Zeit, is a constant, to me mostly unsuccessful, attempt to depreciate Lambert. — Note 1856.

² Yet he meditated the coming strife. To Duke Godfrey he writes that

to the King to return into the bosom of his mother, the holy Roman Church, and to rule the Empire in a more worthy manner; to abstain from simoniacal presentations to benefices; to render due allegiance to his spiritual superior. But when he spoke of Henry to his more confidential friends, it was

The Pope's
admonition
to King
Henry.

in another tone. If his admonitions are treated with contempt it will not move him. "It is safer for us to resist him for his salvation to the shedding of our blood, than by yielding to his will, to consent to his ruin."¹

The admonition probably reached Henry in the most perilous time of his war with the Saxons; he had hardly escaped from their hands, had either fled, or was meditating his ignominious flight from the castle in the Hartzburg. His reply, as suited his for-

About Aug.
18.

tunes, was in the most submissive tone. He acknowledged his sins against Heaven and the Pope; he attributed them to his youth, to the intoxication of imperial power, to the seductions of evil counsellors. He had invaded the property of the Church; he had made simoniacal promotions of unworthy persons. He entreated the clemency of the Pope; he trusted that from henceforth the kingdom and the priesthood, bound together by the necessity of mutual assistance, might adhere to each other in indissoluble union.² Hilde-

be would send envoys to Henry — *quod si nos audierit non aliter de ejus quam nostra salute gaudemus: sin vero nobis odium pro dilectione reddiderit, interminatio qua dicitur, maledictus homo qui prohibet gladium suum a sanguine, super nos, Deo providente, non veniet.* — May, 1073, Regest. i. 9. Compare letter to Rudolph of Suabia, i. 19.

¹ Gregor. Epist. ad Beatricem et Mathildam, 1, xi.

² Epistola Henric. Regis. Mansi, date about Aug. 18, 1073. I refer to this letter Gregory's remarkable words: — "Henricum regem præterea scias dulcedinis et obedientiæ plena nobis verba misisse, et talia, qualia neque

brand was delighted with language more gentle and lowly than had ever been used by the predecessors of Henry to the pontiffs of Rome. Hildebrand even then had not confined himself to his admonition to Henry; he had already erected himself into supreme arbiter of the affairs of Germany. A letter to the insurgent prelates, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, the Bishop of Halberstadt, and the Saxon princes, commanded them to suspend their arms until he should have inquired into the justice of their quarrel with the King their Lord.¹ This was more than a solemn persuasive to peace, and a religious remonstrance on the homicides, conflagrations, the plunder of the churches and of the poor, and the desolation of the country (such language had been becoming in the vicar of Christ); he took the tone of a supreme judge. An act of sacrilege on the part of the Saxons gave Henry, as he supposed, a favorable opportunity for placing the spiritual power on his own side. While negotiations were proceeding, a rising of the Saxon people took place in the neighborhood of Hartzburg. This was the strong fortress which commanded the whole country; from which Henry had made incursions to waste the district around, in which he had found secure refuge from the popular indignation, and from which he had but now been forced to fly. But so long as the Hartzburg remained impregnable, the Saxon liberties were insecure; with but a garrison there the Emperor might at any time renew hostilities. The insurgents surprised this stronghold, but were not con-

ipsi neque antecessores suos recordamur Romanis Pontificibus misisse."

— Herlembaldo. Regest. i. 25, Sept. 27, 1073. On Henry's conduct in this affair Gregory lays great weight.

¹ Regest. i. 39, Dec. 20, 1073.

tent with levelling the military works to the ground. Henry had built a temporary church of timber, furnished with great elegance. The insurgents scrupled not to destroy this sacred edifice, to plunder the treasures, to break the altar to pieces. In wanton insult, or with a fixed design to break the bonds of Henry's attachment to the place, they dug up the bodies of a brother and a son whom he had buried there. The reliques of the Saints were saved with diffi- Feb. 24, 1074. culty, and carried by the trembling clergy to a neighboring sanctuary. The Saxon chieftains shuddered at the consequences of this rash act; Henry's indignation knew no bounds. To that power which was to be used with such commanding energy against himself, he did not hesitate to appeal. He sent messages to Rome to demand the censures of the Pope against the Saxons, all of whom he involved in the odious charge of burning churches, breaking down altars, violating Christian graves, and barbarously insulting the remains of the dead.

But the vengeance of Henry was fulfilled; the Saxon insurrection had been put down at Hohenburg (1075) without the interposition of the Pope, before indeed he could come to any decided resolution.

An embassy in the mean time had arrived in Germany from Rome—an embassy, it might seem, intended to work on the pious feelings as well as on the fears of the king. The mother of Henry had left her peaceful convent sanctuary, and accompanied the Papal legates, the Bishops of Præneste, Ostia, and Cunnæ. Henry was accustomed from his youth to the overweening haughtiness—he had experienced the tyranny—of the prince prelates of Germany.

Embassy
from Rome.

The Italian bishops bred in the school of Hildebrand held even a more high and dictatorial tone. Their first demands were abject, unquestioning submission. They refused to communicate with the King till he had done penance for all his simoniacal acts, and had been absolved from the ban of the Church, under which he lay, either actually or virtually, as employing excommunicated persons for his counsellors. They demanded the dismissal of those persons against whom Pope Alexander had issued his censures, the bishops of Ratisbon, Constance, and Lausanne, the Counts Eberhard and Ulric. They required him also to summon a council of the prelates of Germany and Gaul, in which they were to preside, as representing the Pope. The avowed object of this council was the degradation of all the prelates who owed their rise to simoniacal means. Henry at this time hardly looked beyond his immediate advantages, and the gratification of his passions. Partly yielding to the persuasions of his mother, partly out of revenge against some of the Saxon prelates, obnoxious to censure, especially from hatred of the Bishop of Worms, who alone opposed his unbounded popularity in that city, he was disposed to acquiesce in the convocation of the Council, and to allow full scope to its proceedings.

But most of the bishops dreaded this severe inquisition into their titles; others, of whom the German prelates. chief was Licmar, the learned and sagacious Archbishop of Bremen, stood upon the privileges of the German Church. It was determined that, unless the Pope appeared in person, his representative, and the only lawful president of such a council, was the primate of Germany. Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, a man

of timid and vacillating character, was as ill-qualified to be the representative of Hildebrand in Germany, as boldly to oppose his ambitious encroachments. He feared alike the Pope and the King. The fate of some of his brother prelates might well make him tremble, if the King, notwithstanding his seeming acquiescence, should enter into the contest, and the popular favor take the part of the King. The Bishop of Worms had been driven from his city with the utmost indignity; and it was doubtful whether it was not a faction, ^{Hanno of} eager to avenge the royal cause, which had ^{Cologne.} endangered the life of Hanno, the great Archbishop of Cologne, expelled him from the city, and maintained Cologne for some time in a state of defiant rebellion.¹ The origin of this tumult may show the haughty tyranny of these kingly prelates. The Archbishop was about to leave the city after the celebration of Easter. A vessel was wanted for his voyage. His people, after examining all that were in the port (this purveyance it must be presumed, was of ancient usage), chose that of a rich merchant, cast the valuable lading on the shore, and proceeded to seize the bark for the Archbishop's use. The merchant's men resisted, headed by his son: it ended in a furious fray. When the Archbishop heard of it, he threatened summary punishment against the seditious youths. "For," proceeds the historian, "he was a man endowed with every virtue, and renowned for his justice in civil, as well as in ecclesiastical causes." Lambert admits, indeed, "that he was liable to transports of ungovernable anger." The whole city rose in insurrection; the Archbishop was hurried, to save his

¹ Incertum levitate vulgi, an factione eorum qui vicem regis in archiepis. *popum* ulcisci cupiebant, etc., — Lambert, sub ann. 1074.

life, to the church of St. Peter. His palace, his cellars were plundered: his chapel, with the pontifical robes, and even the sacred vessels, destroyed; one of his attendants, mistaken for the Archbishop, was killed: the Archbishop hardly made his escape in disguise. But the country people were attached to Hanno, perhaps hated the citizens; a military force sprang up among his vassals; the city was forced to surrender. Six hundred of the wealthiest merchants withdrew to the court of King Henry to implore his intercession. The soldiers of the Archbishop, it was given out, without his sanction plundered and committed horrible cruelties. The Archbishop wreaked a terrible vengeance on the first movers in the tumult; the son of the merchant and many others were blinded, many scourged, and the city, the richest and most powerful north of the Alps, was a long time before it recovered its former prosperity.

Siegfried of Mentz might well quail before the difficulties of his position. Not merely was he called upon to summon this dreaded Council, but to carry at once into effect the stern and peremptory decrees of Hildebrand, and the councils which he had held at Rome for the suppression of the married clergy. Throughout Western Christendom these decrees had met with furious, or with sullen and obstinate opposition. In Lombardy not all the preaching of Ariald, nor his martyrdom; not all the eloquence of Damiani, not all the tyranny of Herlembald, nor even the fanaticism of the people, who were taught to abstain from the unholy ministrations of this defiled priesthood, had succeeded in extirpating the evil. Herlembald was now about to suffer the miserable or glorious destiny of Ariald.

Siegfried knew the state of the German clergy ; ^{March 18,} it was not till he was formally threatened with ^{1074.} the Papal censure that he consented to promulgate the decree of Gregory.¹ Even then he attempted to temporize. He did not summon the clergy at once to show their obedience ; he allowed them six months of delay for consideration — six months employed by the clergy only to organize a more obstinate opposition.

A synod met at Erfurt. The partisans of the marriage of the clergy assembled in prevailing ^{October,} numbers. Their language among themselves ^{1074.} had been unmeasured. “ The Pope,” they said, “ must be a heretic or a madman. Has he forgotten the saying of the Lord ? All cannot fulfil his word. The apostle says, ‘ Let him that cannot contain marry.’ He would compel all men to live like angels. Let him take care, while he would do violence to nature, he break not all the bonds which restrain from fornication and every uncleanness. They had rather abandon their priesthood than their wives, and then let the Pope, who thought men too grovelling for him, see if he can find angels to govern the Church.”² Siegfried could not but betray that he was acting a part in opposition to his own judgment ; his arguments, therefore, had little effect. The clergy withdrew to deliberate. Some proposed quietly to return to their own homes. Some of the more violent, with confused but intelligible menace, called for vengeance on him who dared to promulgate this execrable decree ; they threatened to depose the Archbishop, and even to put him to death, as a warning

¹ Siegfried had been already rebuked for other causes by the Pope — Regest. i. 60.

² Lambert, sub ann.

to his successors not to publish such statutes, which they strangely affected to treat as calumnious to the priesthood. The affrighted primate expressed his readiness to appeal to Rome, and to endeavor to obtain some mitigation at least of the obnoxious law. Either to distract the assembly from the main subject in debate, or from mere folly or rapacity, he suddenly revived an old question of his claim on the tithes of Thuringia. These claims had been settled in the treaty at Gerstungen; and the enraged Thuringians, at first with sullen murmurs, at length with open violence, so terrified the Archbishop, that he was glad to make his way, environed by his own soldiers, out of the town. So closed the synod of Erfurt.

But the impatient zeal of Hildebrand would brook no delay. At the head of his Roman clergy, Synod at Rome. men vowed by conscience and religion, by interest and pride, to his cause (Guibert of Ravenna, the Emperor's representative, the representative of the German party in Italy, as yet ventured no opposition), he determined at all hazards, even that of changing the yet obsequious, or at least consenting, Emperor, from an ally in the subjugation of the simoniacal and married clergy into an implacable antagonist,¹ to strike at the root of all these abuses, comprehended under the opprobrious name of simony. He might justly apprehend that the total suppression of the evil was absolutely impossible, while the temporal sovereign possessed the power of conferring spiritual benefices. As long as the greater

¹ In a letter to King Henry (Dec. 7, 1074) he praises him for his amicable reception of his envoys, rejoices that he had determined to destroy simony and the fornication of the clergy. — ii. 30. Compare 31, where he proposes a crusade against the infidels.

dignities, the rich abbeys, or even stations of inferior rank and authority, coveted for their wealth, their dignity, or even their ease or quiet, were in any way at the disposal of the laity, so long would an impoverished sovereign traffic in these promotions, or an ambitious sovereign crowd them with his creatures — each regardless of the worthiness of those elevated to the sacred offices, either looking for remuneration out of the actual revenues of the see, or in servile adherence to his commands.¹ But the Church, as a great proprietor of lands, originally granted and mostly held on the common feudal tenure, was bound by the laws which regulated other benefices. It had been content to receive these estates with their secular advantages and their secular services. The temporal power throughout declared that it did not bestow, or if it sold for any stipulated gift or service the benefice attached to the see, the abbacy, or the prebend, it did not presume to sell the spiritual function, but only the property of the endowment. The sovereign was the liege lord, not of the bishop or the abbot in his hierarchical, solely in his feudal rank.

The form of investiture, indeed, was in favor of Gregory's views; the ring and the staff which the bishop received from the temporal sovereign. The ring, the symbol of his mystic marriage with his diocese; the staff, the sceptre of his spiritual sway, might seem to belong exclusively to his holy function. But this investiture conveyed the right to the temporal possessions

¹ But were the Popes guiltless? Herman of Bamberg had bought his bishopric; he was accused as a Simoniac, and summoned to Rome. By large gifts to Alexander II. he not only obtained pardon under a covenant not to sell any church preferments — he returned in honor with an archbishop's pall. — Lambert, sub ann. 1070.

or endowments of the benefice ; it assigned a local jurisdiction to the bishop ; it was in one form the ancient consent of the laity to the spiritual appointment ; it presumed not to consecrate, but permitted the consecrated person to execute his office in a certain defined sphere, and under the protection and guarantee of the civil power. This was only the outward mark of allegiance the acknowledgment of the secular supremacy as far as the estate or its feudal obligations.

In a council held at Rome at the beginning of the year 1075, Gregory abrogated by one decree the whole right of investiture by the temporal sovereign.¹

Synod of
Rome, Feb.
24-28 about
investitures.

The prohibition was couched in the most imperious and comprehensive terms. It absolutely deposed every bishop, abbot, or inferior ecclesiastic who should receive investiture from any lay person. It interdicted him, whosoever should be guilty of this act of ambition and rebellion (which was the sin of idolatry) until he should have abandoned the benefice so obtained, from all communion in the favor of St. Peter, and from admission into the Church. And if any Emperor, duke, marquis, count, or secular potentate or person should presume to grant such investiture of bishopric or inferior dignity, he was condemned to the same sentence. This statute

¹ Si quis deinceps episcopatum vel abbatiam de manu alicujus laicæ personæ susceperit, nullatenus inter episcopos vel abbates habeatur, nec ulla ei ut episcopo aut abbati audientia concedatur. Insuper ei gratiam beati Petri, et introitum ecclesiæ interdicimus, quoad usque locum, quem sub crimine tam ambitionis quam inobedientiæ, quod est scelus idololatriæ, deseruerit. Similiter etiam de inferioribus ecclesiasticis dignitatibus constituimus. Item, si quis Imperatorum, Ducum, Marchionum, Comitum, vel quilibet sæcularium potestatum, aut personarum, investituram episcopatus, vel alicujus ecclesiasticæ dignitatis dare præsumperit, ejusdem sententiæ vinculo se astrictum sciat. — Labbe. Concil., p. 342.

made a revolution in the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the Church now dominant to the State. In the Empire it annulled the precarious power of the Sovereign over almost half his subjects. All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counsellors, the leaders in the Diets and national assemblies, became to a great degree independent of the Crown: the Emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates were as inviolable as their persons. Where there was no fealty there could be no treason. Every benefice, on the other hand, thus dis severed from the Crown was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the Pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offences the dignity might be forfeited; and as the estates and endowments were now inalienable, and were withdrawn from the national property and became that of the Church and of God, the Pope might be in fact the liege lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world.

From this time the sudden and total change takes place in the courteous and respectful, if still jealous and guarded, intercourse between Henry and the Pope. Till now Henry was content to sacrifice the simoniacal and the married clergy, and to be the submissive agent of the Pope in their degradation. They are now, with short intervals but of seeming peace, resolute, declared, unscrupulous, remorseless enemies. Each is determined to put forth his full powers, each to enlist in his party the subjects of the other. If Gregory had condescended, which he

Breach between the Pope and the Emperor.

did not, to dissemble his deliberate scheme, his avowed sacred duty to subject the temporal to the spiritual power, a man of Henry's experience, even if without natural sagacity, could not but perceive what was now at issue. This act despoiled the Emperor of one of his most valuable prerogatives ; a prerogative indispensable to his authority.

Nor was Henry now in a condition tamely to endure the aggression even of the Pope. The sudden revolution in the German mind in his favor, the victory of Hohenburg, the submission of the Saxons, the captivity of their chiefs (the fruits of that victory) might have intoxicated a mind less unused to success. Nor was he without powerful allies, pledged by their interests to his cause, and incensed by the bold and uncompromising manner in which the Pope asserted and seemed determined to enforce his supremacy.¹ The German Church as shown at Erfurt, had still a strong inclination to independence. Of the more powerful prelates, some indeed were old, some irresolute ; but some, sharing in his condemnation, were committed to his side. Hanno of Cologne died² during the early part of the contention. Siegfried of Mentz was timid, wavering, consciously oppressed by the fearful responsibility of his position. By the same Roman synod, Licmar, Archbishop of Bremen, Werner of Strasburg, Herman of Bamberg, Henry of Spire, William of Pavia, Cunibert of Turin, Dionysius of Piacenza, besides the three

¹ See the additions made to the *Regesta* of Gregory VII., in Mabillon *Correspondence*, ii. 143.

² Dec. 4, 1075. According to Lambert he went "ad angelos." Miracles were wrought at his tomb. See his high character, a sort of ideal of a prelate of those days. "If austere, magnificent; lavish to monasteries;" of his ambition and worldly pride not a word! Compare Berthold, *sub ann.*

Bishops of Constance, Zeitz, and Lausanne, the proscribed counsellors of Henry, were interdicted from the performance of their functions. The Saxon prelates were now conquered rebels; the Bishop of Worms an exile from his city. Few were disposed by denying the legality of lay investiture to imperil their own right to the estates of their churches. But the more determined and reckless resistance was among the partisans of the married clergy. Siegfried, yielding to the urgent commands, to the menaces of the Pope, called a second synod at Mentz.¹ The Papal Legate was present; he displayed the mandate of the Apostolic See, that the bishops in their several dioceses should compel the priests to renounce their wives or abstain altogether from their sacred ministry. The whole assembly rose; so resolute was their language, so fierce were their gestures, that the Archbishop again trembled for his life. He declared that from henceforth he would take no concern in such perilous matters, but leave the Pope to execute his own decrees.

At Passau the Bishop Altman had already not only published the papal prohibition against the marriage of the clergy; he interdicted the married clergy from the altar. He had met with stubborn, sullen resistance. On St. Stephen's Day he ascended the pulpit, A.D. 1074. and read the Pope's brief; he would have been torn in pieces but for the intervention of some of the powerful citizens. Bishop Henry of Coire hardly escaped with his life.²

No doubt it was this which raised a fixed and deter-

¹ Lambert.

² Lambert, sub ann. 1074. Compare Vit. Altmanni, apud Pertz, **xiv** p. 232.

Effects of decree against married clergy.

mined opposition to Hildebrand in a large party of the clergy throughout Latin Christendom, more especially in Italy and in Germany.¹ The manner in which the Pope commanded the execution of the decree aggravated its harshness and cruelty. The Pope deliberately sacrificed the cherished sanctity, the inviolability of the priesthood; or rather he disowned as a priesthood, and cast forth to shame and ignominy those whom he branded as unworthy of its privileges. The personal exposure and degradation could not be more galling. By the judgment of the laity, by force employed against them by unhalloved hands, they were not merely to be prohibited from their sacred functions; they were expelled from the choir, and thrust down into the place of the penitents. Even bishops were to be summarily degraded, or rather not recognized as bishops.² Who may imagine the fierceness of the more rude and profligate, thus sternly and almost suddenly interrupted in their licentiousness; whose secret but ill-concealed voluptuousness was dragged to light and held up to shame and obloquy, perhaps to the now unawed vengeance of the injured husband or father. In proportion to their unprincipled looseness would be the passion of their resentment, the depth of their vindictiveness. But these, it may be charitably, and as far as the documents show, justly concluded, were the few. What must have been the bitterness of heart of those, the far larger part of the clergy, whose marriage, or at least an implied

¹ Berthold (sub ann. 1075) says of the edict against the marriage of the clergy, that it caused maximum odium in dominum apostolicum, et *per paucos eos qui consentirent ei*. — Apud Pertz, p. 278. Yet Berthold was an Hildebrandist.

² Letter to Adela, Countess of Flanders, iv. 10, and to Robert, iv. 11.

and solemn engagement, almost as sacred as marriage, had been endeared by the sweet charities of life, by the habits of mutual affection, the common ties of parental love. Their wives were to be torn from them, and treated with the indignity of prostitutes; their children to be degraded as bastards. In some cases these wretched women were driven to suicide; they burned themselves, or were found dead in their beds from grief, or by their own hands; and this was proclaimed as the vengeance of God upon their sins.¹ With some of the married clergy there may have been a consciousness, a misgiving of wrong, at least of weakness inconsistent with the highest clerical function; but with others it was a deliberate conviction, founded on the authority of St. Paul; on the usage of the primitive Church, justified by the law of Eastern Christendom, and in Milan asserted to rest on the authority of St. Ambrose; as well as on a conscientious assurance of the evils, the manifest and flagrant evils, of enforced clerical celibacy. And these men, even when they acknowledged their weakness, and were content with the lower stations in religious estimation, were to be mingled up in one sweeping anathema with the worst profligates; to be condemned to poverty and shame, to be thrown loose to the popular judgment, the popular jealousy, the popular fury.

¹ Paul Bernried triumphs in the misery of these women, many of them the wives, as he acknowledges, of the clergy. *Interea super ipsas quoque uxores, seu concubinas Nicolaitarum sævit divina ultio. Nam quædam illarum in reprobum sensum traditæ, semetipsas incendio tradiderunt: aliquæ dum sanæ cubitum essent mortuæ repertæ sunt in matutino absque ullo præeunte infirmitatis indicio: aliquarum etiam corpora, post evulsas animas, maligni spiritus rapientes et in sua latibula reponentes, humanâ sepulturâ privaverunt.* In what shape did these malignant spirits appear? *Vit. Gregory VII. Murat. S. I. iii.*

It was not indeed in Germany or Lombardy alone that the opposition to one or both the Hildebrandine decrees against lay investiture and the marriage of the clergy encountered fierce opposition. The latter, as of more immediate operation, excited the most furious passion. It was about this time that the Archbishop of Rouen, venturing to read the decree in his cathedral, was driven from the pulpit with a shower of stones. At the Council of Paris,¹ when the decree was read, there was a loud outcry of appeal to St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy. The Abbot of Pont-Isère² dared to say that the Pope's commands, just or unjust, must be obeyed. He was dragged out of the assembly, spat upon, struck in the face by the King's servants, hardly rescued alive.³ Everywhere, in Italy, in Rome itself, in France, throughout Germany, the decrees were received with the most vigorous or stubborn oppugnance; Gregory acknowledges the reluctance with which it was submitted to by the great mass of the clergy, the tardiness of the bishops to enforce its penalties.⁴ This, doubtless, more than the strife with the empire, and the collision between the Italian and German party, was the chief source of the deep and wide-spread rancor excited in

¹ Mansi, sub ann. Orderic. Vital.

² If the bishops of France, writes Gregory, are lukewarm in enforcing these decrees, we hereby interdict the people from attending the ministrations of such false priests. — iv. 20.

³ Epist. Theodor. Virdunens. ad Gregor. VII. Martene et Durand. i. 218. Epistola cujusdam, p. 231. The populace sometimes took the other side. The people of Cambray burned a man for venturing to say that the Simoniac or married clergy were not to be allowed to say mass. So writes Gregory. The clergy of Cambray were generally married. Gregory would make this man a martyr.

⁴ Ad hæc tamens inobedientes, *exceptis perpaucis*, tam execrandam consuetudinem (simony and marriage) nullâ studuerunt prohibitione decidere, nullâ districtione punire. — Ad Rodolph. ii. 45.

the hearts of men, rancor almost unprecedented, against Gregory VII. Later history shows Hildebrand, if not an object of admiration, of awe. ^{Hatred} ^{against} Hildebrand. Those who most deprecate his audacious ambition, his assumption of something bordering on divinity, respect the force and dignity of his character. The man who by the mere power of mind, by spiritual censures, without an army, except that which he levied by his influence over others, with enemies in his own city, aspired to rule the world, to depose the mightiest sovereigns, to raise up a barrier against the dominion of mere brute force and feudal tyranny, is contemplated, if by some with enthusiastic veneration, by others if with aversion, as the Incarnation of anti-Christian spiritual pride, nevertheless not without the homage of their wonder, and wonder not unmingled with respect. But in his own day the hostility against his name did not confine itself to indignant and vehement invectives against his overweening ambition, severity and imperiousness; there is no epithet of scorn or debasement, no imaginable charge of venality, rapacity, cruelty, or even licentiousness, which is not heaped upon him, and that even by bishops of the opposite party.¹ The wilful promoting of unnatural sins is retorted by the married clergy on the assertor of clerical chastity; even his austere personal virtue does not place him above calumny; his intimate alliance with the Countess Matilda, the profound devotion of that lofty female to her spiritual Father, his absolute command over her mind is attributed at one time to criminal intercourse,² at another to magic.

¹ That which in the poetical invective (I am ashamed to abuse the word poetry) of Benzo, apud Menckenium, p. 975 (he it observed a bishop), takes the coarsest and plainest form, is noticed also by the grave Lambert of Herzfeld.

² *Hæc est mulier illa, de qua ab obtrectatoribus fidei et consultatoribus*

Even at the time at which Hildebrand was thus declaring war against the empire, and precipitating the inevitable conflict for supremacy over the world, he was not safe in Rome. It cannot be known whether Guibert of Parma, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the representative of the imperial interests in Italy, who in Rome had opposed all that he dared—a sullen and dissembled resistance to the Pope—was privy to the daring enterprise of Cencius. That leader and descendant of the old turbulent barons of Romagna had old scores of vengeance to repay against Hildebrand, the adviser of that policy which had brought down the Normans for their subjugation.

Cencius had been master of the castle of St. Angelo, and the master of the castle of St. Angelo was an important partisan for the Pope. The Normans might now seem to have done their work; for some offence they were excommunicated in their turn by the fearless Gregory; the Counts of Tusculum were to be the protectors of the Roman See. But Cencius was after-

veritatis crimen incestus sancto Pontifici objiciebatur.—Hugon. Chron. apud Pertz, x. p. 462. His defenders, singularly enough, think it necessary to appeal to miracle to explain this domination of a powerful and religious mind like Hildebrand's, over perhaps a weakly religious one like Matilda's. This scandal appears in its grossest and most particular form in Cosmas of Prague, who adds, "*hæc sufficit breviter dixisse, quæ utinam non dixissem.*" Apud Menckenium, p. 39. The age of one of the two might be enough to contradict those foul tales, if they were worth contradiction. Yet was the charge publicly made in the address of the German Bishops in the Synod at Mentz. Thus writes a Bishop. Qui etiam factore quodam gravissimi scandali totam ecclesiam replesti de conventu et cohabitatione alienæ mulieris familiariori, quam necesse est. In quâ re verecundia nostra magis quam causa laborat, quamvis hæc generalis querela ubique personuerit omnia judicia omnia decreta per feminas in sede apostolicâ actuari denique per fœminas totum orbem ecclesiæ administrari. Udalrici Cod. apud Eccard. ii. p. 172. I believe this as little as the incests, violation of nuns and virgins charged by one or two writers against Henry.

wards suspected of dealings with the excommunicated Guibert. He was attacked and taken; the castle of St. Angelo for a time dismantled; the life of Cencius was spared only on the merciful intervention of the Countess Matilda.¹ Cencius therefore had long arrears of revenge; success would make him an ally who might dictate his own terms to those who had a common interest in the degradation of Gregory. Master of the Pope's person, he might expect not merely not to be disowned, but to claim whatever reward might be demanded by his ambition.

On the eve of Christmas-day the rain had poured down in torrents. The Romans remained A. D. 1075.
Pope seized
by Cencius. in their houses; the Pope, with but a few ecclesiastics, was keeping the holy vigil in the remote church of Santa Maria Maggiore. The wild night suited the wild purpose of Cencius. The Pope was in the act of administering the Holy Communion, when a fierce shout of triumph and a shriek of terror sounded through the church. The soldiers of Cencius burst in, swept along the nave, dashed down the rails, rushed to the altar, and seized the Pontiff. One fatal blow might have ended the life of Hildebrand and changed the course of human events; it glanced aside, and only wounded his forehead. Bleeding, stripped of his holy vestments, but patient and gentle, the Pope made no resistance; he was dragged away, mounted behind one of the soldiers, and imprisoned in a strong tower.² The rumor ran rapidly through the city; all the night, trumpets pealed, bells tolled. The clergy Rescue. who were officiating in the different churches broke off

¹ Cencius, according to Lambert, had been excommunicated by the Pope

² Bonizo.

their services, and ran about the streets summoning the populace to rescue and revenge ; soldiers rushed to the gates to prevent the prisoner from being carried out of the town. At the dawn of morn the people assembled in the Capitol, ignorant whether the Pope was dead or alive. When the place of his imprisonment was known, they thronged to the siege ; engines were brought from all quarters ; the tottering walls began to yield. Cencius shuddered at his own deed. One faithful friend and one noble matron had followed the Pope into his dungeon. The man had covered his shivering body with furs, and was cherishing his chilled feet in his own bosom ; the woman had stanchd the blood, had bound up the wound in his head, and sat weeping beside him. Cencius, cowardly as cruel, had no course left but to throw himself at the feet of the Pontiff, and to implore his mercy. In the most humiliating language he confessed his sins, his sacrilege, his impiety. The Pope, thus insulted, thus wounded, thus hardly escaped from a miserable death, maintained throughout the mild dignity and self-command of a Christian Pontiff. His wisdom might indeed lead him to dread the despair of a ruffian. “Thine injuries against myself I freely pardon. Thy sins against God, against his mother, his apostles, and his whole Church, must be expiated. Go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and if thou returnest alive, present thyself to us, and be reconciled with God. As thou hast been an example of sin, so be thou of repentance !” Christ himself might seem to be speaking in his Vicegerent.¹

Gregory was brought out ; he made a motion to the

¹ Paul. Bernried, Vit. Greg. Lambert, Berthold sub ann. 1076. Arrulf v. 6, apud Pertz. Bonizo. Lib. ad Amic.

people to arrest the fury with which they were rushing to storm the tower; it was mistaken for a sign of distress. They broke down, they clambered over, the walls. Gregory, yet stained with blood, stood in the midst of his deliverers; he was carried in triumph to the church from which he had been dragged, finished the service, and returned to the Lateran. Cencius and his kindred fled; their houses and towers were razed by the indignant populace.

This adventure showed to Hildebrand at once his danger and his strength. It was not the signal for, it was rather simultaneous with, the final and irreparable breach with the King — a breach which, however, had been preparing for some months. Guibert of Ravenna was allowed to depart unquestioned, if not unsuspected as the secret author of this outrage, suspicions which were not lightened by one of his acts which took place some time after — the burial of Cencius, which he celebrated with great magnificence in Pavia. But even against Guibert Hildebrand now countenanced no such charge, still less against Henry himself. Noth-
 ing of the kind is intimated in the letter addressed but two weeks after to the King of Germany, which, if not the direct declaration of war, was the sullen murmuring of the thunder before the storm.

It is important carefully to observe the ground which Hildebrand took in that manifesto of war, of
 war disguised under the words of reconcilia-
 tion: whether the lofty moral assertion that he was placed on high to rebuke the unchristian acts of kings, or even to assert the liberties of their oppressed subjects; or the lower, the questionable right to confer

Letter to
 King Henry.

benefices ; and the King's disobedience in ecclesiastical matters to the See of Rome.¹

“ Deeply and anxiously weighing the responsibilities of the trust committed to us by St. Peter, we have with great hesitation granted our apostolic benediction, for it is reported that thou still holdest communion with excommunicated persons. If this be true, the grace of that benediction avails thee nothing. Seek ghostly counsel of some sage priest, and perform the penance imposed upon thee.” He proceeds to reprove the King for the hypocritical submissiveness of his letters, and the disobedience of his conduct. The grant of the archbishopric of Milan without waiting the decision of the apostolic see ; the investiture of the bishoprics of Fermo and Spoleto made to persons unknown to the Pope, were acts of irreverence to St. Peter and his successor. “ The apostolic synod over which we presided this year, thought fit in the decay of the Christian religion to revert to the ancient discipline of the Church, that discipline on which depends the salvation of man. This decree (however some may presume to call it an insupportable burden or intolerable oppression) we esteem a necessary law ; all Christian kings and people are bound directly to accept and to observe it. As thou art the highest in dignity and power, so shouldest thou surpass others in devotion to Christ. If, however, thou didst consider this abrogation of a bad custom hard or unjust to thyself, thou shouldest have sent to our presence some of the wisest and most religious of thy realm, to persuade us, in our condescension, to mitigate its

¹ This missive must have been received early in January, when Henry was at Goslar. — Stenzel, *in loc.*

force in some way not inconsistent with the honor of God and the salvation of men's souls. We exhort thee, in our parental love, to prefer the honor of Christ to thine own, and to give full liberty to the Church, the Spouse of God." Hildebrand then alludes to the victory of Henry over the Saxons, with significant reference to the fate of Saul, whom success in war led into fatal impiety.

The date of this letter, when written, and when received, is not absolutely certain; ¹ it was coupled with or immediately followed by a peremptory summons to Henry to appear in Rome to answer for all his offences before the tribunal of the Pope, and before a synod of ecclesiastics; if he should refuse or delay, he was at once to suffer the sentence of excommunication. The 22d of February was the day appointed for his appearance.

Thus the King, the victorious king of the Germans, was solemnly cited as a criminal to answer undefined charges, to be amenable to laws which the judge had assumed the right of enacting, interpreting, enforcing by the last penalties. The whole affairs of the empire were to be suspended while the King stood before the bar of his imperious arbiter; no delay was allowed; the stern and immutable alternative was humble and instant obedience, or that sentence which involved deposition from the Empire, eternal perdition.²

In this desperate emergency one course alone seemed

¹ It is dated by Jaffe Jan. 8.

² Aderant præterea Hildebrandi Papæ legati, denunciante Regi, ut secundâ feriâ secundæ hebdomadæ in quadragesimâ ad synodum Romæ occurreret, de criminibus quæ objicerentur, causam dicturus: alioquin sciret se absque omni procrastinatione eodem die de corpore sanctæ ecclesiæ apostolico anathemate abscindendum esse. — Lambert.

left open. In Germany the idea of the temporal sovereign was but vague, indistinct, and limited; he was but the head of an assemblage of independent princes, his powers, if not legally, actually bounded by his ability to enforce obedience. The Cæsar was but an imposing and magnificent title, which Teutonic pride gloried in having appropriated to its sovereign, but against which the old Teutonic independence opposed a strong, often invincible resistance. The idea of the Pope was an integral part of German Christianity; dread of excommunication part of the faith, to question which was a bold act of infidelity.

It was only then by invalidating the title of the individual Pope that he could be lawfully resisted, or his authority shaken in the minds of the multitude. It was a daring determination, but it was the only determination to which Henry and his ecclesiastical counsellors could well have recourse, to depose a pope who had thus declared war, even to the death, against him. Not a day was to be lost; if the Pope were still Pope on the fatal 22nd of February, the irrepeatable excommunication would be passed. The legates who brought this denunciatory message were dismissed with ignominy. Messengers were despatched with breathless haste to
A.D. 1076. summon the prelates of Germany to meet at the faithful city of Worms, on Septuagesima Sunday, January 24th. After the death of Hanno of Cologne, Henry, knowing too well the danger of that princely see in able hands, had forced into it a monk named Hildorf, of obscure birth, insignificant in person, feeble in mind.

On the appointed day, besides the secular partisans

of Henry, the bishops and abbots of Germany obeyed the royal summons in great numbers. Synod of Worms. Siegfried of Mentz¹ took his seat as president of the synod. Cardinal Hugo the White, the same man who had taken the lead in the election of Hildebrand, and commended him by the glowing panegyric on his virtues to the Roman people, came forward, no doubt, as pretending to represent the clergy of Rome, and arraigned Pope Gregory before the synod as the worst and wickedest of men. His extravagant and monstrous charges dwelt on the early life of Gregory, on the bribery and violence by which he had gained the Papacy, the licentiousness, the flagitiousness of his life as Pope, his cruelty, his necromancy. He demanded the deposition of Gregory VII. With loud unanimous acclamation the synod declared that a man guilty of such crimes (crimes of which no shadow of proof was adduced, and which rested on the assertion of one himself excommunicated, it was averred, for simony) had forfeited the power of binding and loosing, he was no longer Pope. The renunciation of allegiance was drawn up in the strictest and most explicit form. "I, * * * bishop of * * *, disclaim from this hour all subjection and allegiance to Hildebrand, and will neither esteem nor call him Pope." Two bishops only, Adelbert of Wurtzburg and Herman of Metz, hesitated to sign this paper. They argued that it was unjust and uncanonical to condemn a bishop without a general council, without accusers and defenders, and without communicating the charges against him, how much more a pope, against whom the accusation of a bishop, or even an archbishop, was not valid. But William of Utrecht, the boldest,

¹ He had been degraded by the Pope. — Lambert, sub ann.

the most learned, and the staunchest partisan of Henry, offered them the alternative of disclaiming their allegiance to the King, or affixing their signature. To this force they yielded an unwilling approbation.¹

The letter of Henry to the Pope, conveying the decree of the council, was couched in the most arrogant and insulting terms, and so neutralized the bitter truths which, more calmly expressed, might have wrought on impartial minds, if such there were. “Henry, not by usurpation, but by God’s ordinance, King, to Hildebrand, no longer Pope, but the false monk.” It accused him of the haughtiness with which he tyrannized over every order of the Church, and had trampled archbishops, bishops, the whole clergy, under his feet. He had pretended to universal knowledge as to universal power. “By the authority of the priesthood, thou hast even threatened to deprive us of our royal authority, that priesthood to which thou wast never called by Christ.” “By craft thou hast got money, by money influence, by influence the power of the sword; by the sword thou hast mounted the throne of peace, and from the throne of peace destroyed peace, arming subjects against their rulers, bringing bishops appointed by God into contempt, and exposing them to the judgment of the laity. Us too, consecrated of God, amenable to no judge but God, who can be deposed for no crime but absolute apostasy, thou hast ventured to assail, despising the words of that true pope St. Peter, ‘Fear God! honor the King!’ Thou that honorest

¹ The Chronicle of Hildesheim says that the bishop of that city signed only from fear of death, *sed quod scripserat, ut homo sagacissimi ingenii obelo supposito damnavit*. This bishop stood on dangerous ground as a leader in the Saxon insurrection.

not the King fearest not God! St. Paul held accursed even an angel from heaven who should preach another Gospel: this curse falls upon thee who teachest this new doctrine." "Thus accursed then, thus condemned by the sentence of all our bishops, and by our own, down! Leave the apostolic throne which thou hast usurped. Let another take the chair of St. Peter, one who preaches not violence and war, but the sound doctrine of the holy Apostle. I, Henry, by the grace of God King, with all the bishops of my realm, say unto thee, 'Down! down!'"

Another letter was addressed to the clergy and people of Rome. In this the King accuses the Pope of having sworn to deprive him of the ^{To clergy and people of Rome} kingdom of Italy. "Gregory would hazard his own life, or strip the King of his life and kingdom." As patrician, therefore, Henry had deposed the Pope, and now commands them on their allegiance to rise up against him. "Be the most loyal the first to join in his condemnation. We do not ask you to shed his blood; let him suffer life, which, after he is deposed, will be more wretched to him than death; but if he resist, compel him to yield up the apostolic throne, and make way for one whom we shall elect, who will have both the will and the power to heal the wounds inflicted on the Church by their present pastor."

The German Church seemed to enter into the bold and open revolt of Henry; in Lombardy the old party of Cadalous and of the married clergy, maintained and guided by Guibert of Ravenna, ^{Early in February.} showed equal resolution. A synod at Piacenza ratified the decree of Worms.

Gregory in the mean time had summoned his third

Lateran Council. Feb. 21, 22, 1076. council in the Lateran. He sat among his assembled bishops. The hymn had ceased which implored the descent of the Holy Ghost on this great Christian assembly. The bold and sudden entrance of Roland, a priest of Parma, was hardly perceived amid the grave occupation to which (as genuine descendants of the old Romans, who, when the fate of kings and nations depended on their vote, usually commenced their solemn council by consulting the augurs, and waiting for some significant omen) they had surrendered their absorbed attention. An egg had been found which, by its mysterious form, portended the issue of the conflict. What seemed a black serpent, the type of evil, rose as it were in high relief, and coiled around the smooth shell; but it had struck on what seemed a shield, and recoiled, bruised and twisting in a mortal agony. On this sight sate gazing the mute ecclesiastical senate.¹

But the voice of Roland made itself heard. "The King and the bishops of Germany send this mandate. Down at once from the throne of St. Peter! yield up the usurped government of the Roman Church! none must presume to such honor but those chosen by the general voice and approved by the Emperor." He turned to the amazed assembly — "Ye, my brethren,

¹ Incipiens synodum pastor Gregorius, ovum
Gallinæ sculptum, gestans in cortice scutum
Et colubrum nigrum qui tendebat caput, ictu
Quippe percussus quodam, pertingere sursum
Non potuit, caudamque plicans dabat sinuatam.
Non erat hæc plana, sed erat sculptura levata.
Ad synodum fertur, nunquam par ante repertum
Quod dum miratur, prædictus et ecce Robertus * * *

DONIZO.

¹ *nis*, be it remembered, is history, not poetry. Robert is called elsewhere Roland.

are commanded to present yourselves at the Feast of Pentecost before the King my master, there to receive a Pope and Father ; for this man is no Pope, but a rav-
ening wolf."

The fiery Bishop of Porto sprang from his seat and shouted with a loud voice, " Seize him ! " Cencius, the governor of the city,¹ and his soldiers sprang forth to hew the audacious envoy in pieces. Gregory interposed his own person, protected the King's ambassador, and with difficulty restored order. He received the documents presented by Roland, and with his wonted calm dignity, read the acts of the councils, with the taunting letter of the King.

Murmurs of vehement indignation burst from the whole synod ; they sank again as Gregory commenced his address, urging them to respect the sanctity of the place. In his speech, skilfully it may hardly be said, yet naturally, his own cause was assumed to be that of the clergy, of the Church, of Christianity. " These were the coming and predicted days in which it behoved the clergy to show the innocence of the dove, blended with the wisdom of the serpent. The forerunner of Anti-Christ had risen against the Church ; the dry harvest was about to be wet with the blood of the saints. Now is the time when it will be shown who is ashamed of his Lord, of whom the Lord will be ashamed at his second coming. Better is it to die for Christ and his holy laws, than, by shamefully yielding to those who violate and trample them under foot, to be traitors to the Church : not to resist such impious men were to de-

¹ Stephen Cencius, another of the same family, according to Bonizo, brother of the famous Cencius, a partisan of the Pope. He was afterwards put to a cruel death by the Imperialists. — Bonizo, p. 316.

ny the faith of Christ.” With the gravity of an ancient augur he proceeded to interpret the sign of the egg. The serpent was the dragon of the Apocalypse raging against the Church; and in the same old Roman spirit he drew the omen of victory from its discomfiture. “Now, therefore, brethren, it behoves us to draw the sword of vengeance; now must we smite the foe of God and of his Church; now shall his bruised head, which lifts itself in its haughtiness against the foundation of the faith and of all the Churches, fall to the earth; there, according to the sentence pronounced against his pride, to go upon his belly, and eat the dust. Fear not, little flock, saith the Lord, for it is the will of your Father to grant you the kingdom. Long enough have ye borne with him; often enough have ye admonished him: let his seared conscience be made at length to feel!”

The whole synod replied with one voice, “Let thy wisdom, most holy Father, whom the divine mercy has raised up to rule the world in our days, utter such a sentence against this blasphemer, this usurper, this tyrant, this apostate, as may crush him to the earth, and make him a warning to future ages. . . . Draw the sword, pass the judgment, *that the righteous may rejoice when he seeth the vengeance, and wash his hands in the blood of the ungodly.*”¹

The formal sentence was delayed, to prepare it in more awful terms, till the next day. On the morning arrived letters from many prelates and nobles of Ger-

¹ Psalm lviii. 10. Paul Bernried, the fullest authority on this period, gives the whole as the proceedings of one day. Other writers seem to show that they occupied two; but the distribution of the business between these two days is somewhat conjectural.

many and Italy, disclaiming the acts of the synods at Worms and Piacenza, and imploring the forgiveness of the Pope for their enforced assent to these decrees. The Pontiff again took his seat in the Lateran, encircled by 110 bishops and abbots. The first sentence fell on Siegfried of Mentz, and the prelates who had concurred in the proceedings at Worms. They were suspended from their episcopal functions, interdicted from the holy Eucharist, unless in the hour of death, and after due and accepted penance. Those who had assented from compulsion were allowed time to make their peace with the apostolic see. The prelates who met at Piacenza were condemned to the same punishment. Some other censures were spoken against other prelates and nobles of the empire; but the awe-struck assembly awaited in eager expectation that against the arch-criminal, King Henry. The Empress Agnes was among the audience; the stern stoicism of the monastic life had even wrought a mother's heart to listen to the sentence, perhaps of eternal damnation, against her son.¹

Hildebrand commenced his sentence with an address to St. Peter, and renewed protestations of the reluctance against which he had been com-^{Henry}deposed. pelled to ascend the pontifical throne. "In full confidence in the authority over all Christian people, granted by God to the delegate of St. Peter," "for the honor and defence of the Church, in the name of the Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by the power and authority of St. Peter, I interdict King Henry, son of Henry the Emperor, who in his unexampled pride has risen against the Church, from the gov

¹ Berthold, p. 283.

ernment of the whole realm of Germany and of Italy. I absolve all Christians from the oaths which they have sworn or may swear to him; and forbid all obedience to him as King. For it is just that he who impugns the honor of the Church, should himself forfeit all the honor which he seems to have; and because he has scorred the obedience of a Christian, nor returned to the Lord, from whom he had revolted by holding communion with the excommunicate, by committing many iniquities, and despising the admonitions, which, as thou knowest, I have given him for his salvation, and has separated himself from the Church by creating schism: I bind him, therefore, in thy name, in the bonds of thy anathema; that all the nations may know and may acknowledge that thou art Peter, that upon thy rock the Son of the living God has built his Church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”¹

When the Senate or the Emperors of Rome issued their mandates to the extremity of the world, they were known to be supported by vast and irresistible armies.

¹ For the modern views on the subject of deposing kings, see perhaps the ablest work. Gosselin, *Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age*. The foundation of Fenelon's theory, embraced partially by M. de Maistre, fully by M. Gosselin, is, that the Pope's power of dethroning sovereigns rested on a “droit public,” acknowledged throughout Europe. But whence this droit public, but from the exaggerated claims of the Pope and the clergy, beaten by superstitious terrors into the minds of men? The whole argument of Gosselin's book is, that the power existed and was acknowledged, therefore it was absolute law. De Maistre has said that possession on one hand, consent (assentiment) on the other, is the foundation of all power; but what tyranny does not this justify and eternize? The first premise nobody will deny in one sense; and we even may admit the conclusion, so far as it may mitigate the attributing the growth of such principles to deliberate, far-seeing, conscious ambition on the part of the clergy and the Pope; but it will not absolve them from having been unconsciously influenced by the desire of corporate or personal aggrandizement, or from their abuse of the principles, when admitted, by making them subservient to their own passions and to their own temporal ends.

The mandates of Hildebrand were to promulgate, to execute themselves. He was master, indeed, in Rome; he might depend, perhaps, on the support of his ally, the Countess Matilda; he might possibly, as a last refuge, summon the Normans, an uncertain trust, to his succor. But on these things he seemed to disdain to waste a thought; on himself, on his censures, on the self-assumed righteousness of his cause, on the fears of men, and doubtless on what he believed the pledged and covenanted protection of the Saints, of Christ, of God, he calmly relied for what he would not doubt would be his final triumph.

King Henry heard in Utrecht, March 27, the sentence of the Pope. His first impression was that of dismay; but he soon recovered himself, affected to treat it with contempt, and determined to revenge himself by the excommunication of the Pope. The ^{Measures of Henry.} Bishops of Toul and Verdun, though attached to Henry, had disapproved of the condemnation of the Pope; they secretly withdrew from the city to escape the perilous office now demanded of them. In William of Utrecht fidelity to the king had grown into a fierce hatred of the Pope. Not merely did he utter the sentence of excommunication, but followed it up with busy zeal. At every opportunity, even when performing the sacred office, he broke forth against the perjurer, the adulterer, the false apostle; and pronounced him excommunicated, not by himself alone, but ^{William of Utrecht excommunicates the Pope.} by all the bishops of Germany.¹ Nor was William absolutely alone; a council at Pavia, ^{April.} summoned by the indefatigable Guibert, met and anathematized Gregory.

¹ Omnibus paene diebus solemnitur, rabido ore declamavit. — Lambert.

But while these vain thunders had no effect on the rigid churchmen and the laity who adhered to the Pope, the excommunication of Henry was working in the depths of the German mind, and mingling itself up with, and seeming to hallow, all the other motives for jealousy, hatred, and revenge, which prevailed in so many parts of the empire. A vast and formidable conspiracy began to organize itself, hardly in secret. The Dukes Rudolph of Swabia, Guelf of Bavaria, Berthold of Carinthia, with the Bishops of Wurzburg and Metz, were at the head of the league, which comprehended men knew not whom, there was no one whom it might not comprehend. The King summoned a diet at Worms, but the prudent, and those conscious of sinister designs, kept away: it separated without coming to any conclusion. A second was summoned for St. Peter's day, to meet at Mentz.

But even before the diet at Worms an event had taken place which had appalled all Germany — the sudden death of William of Utrecht. Terrible rumors of the circumstances of his fate spread throughout the land, darkening, no doubt, as they went on. In the delirium of his mortal sickness he had reproached himself for his wicked and impious conduct to the Pope, entreated his attendants not to weary themselves with fruitless prayers for a soul irrecoverably lost. He had died, it was said, without the Holy Communion. The blasphemer of Hildebrand had perished in an agony of despair; and God had not only pronounced his awful vengeance against the blasphemer himself, the cathedral which had witnessed the ceremony of Gregory's excommunication had been struck by the lightning of heaven.

Death of
William of
Utrecht.

Even after death the terrible power of Gregory pursued William of Utrecht. In answer to an inquiry of the Bishop of Liege, the Pope sternly replied, that, if William of Utrecht had knowingly communicated with the excommunicated Henry (and of this fact and of his impenitence there could be no doubt), the inexorable interdict must follow him beyond the grave. Unabsolved he lived and died, there was no absolution after death; no prayers, no sacrifices, no alms could be offered for the soul of William of Utrecht.¹

Henry looked abroad into the Empire, which, but the year before, his victory at Hohenburg Desertion of Henry by the Princes. had awed at least into outward peace, and where the obsequious clergy at Worms had seemed to join him almost with unanimity in his defiance of Hildebrand. On every side he now saw hostility, avowed or secret, conspiracy, desertion; the princes meditating revolt; the prelates either openly renouncing or shaken in their allegiance. Herman of Metz had released some of the Saxon chieftains committed to his charge; he was evidently assuming the rank of head of the Hildebrandine party among the ecclesiastics of Germany. Henry had threatened to revenge himself by marching at once and occupying Metz, but had been obliged to abandon that decisive measure. The defection of Otho of Nordheim, to whom the final suppression of the Saxon rebellion had been entrusted, and who at least had listened to the overtures of the insurgents, was still more embarrassing, and broke up all his warlike plans.

At Mentz the assembly both of prelates and nobles

¹ Regest. iv. 6. Godfrey of Lorraine too had fallen by the hands of murderers in Friesland.

May 15.
Diet at
Mentz.

was more numerous than at the second assembly summoned at Worms; but the leaders of the opposition whom Henry hoped either to gain or to overawe, and whose attendance, sinking from the imperious language of command, he had condescended to implore, still kept aloof, and, without declaration of hostility, maintained a sullen but menacing neutrality. Yet enough appeared at the Diet to show the dreadful effects to be apprehended from the approaching conflict, and the nature of the resistance which was to be encountered by the King. Throughout Germany house was divided against house, family against family, kindred against kindred. Udo, Archbishop of Treves, the third of the great Rhenish prelates, had passed the Alps to make his peace with Gregory; he had been received with courtesy, and had yielded himself up absolutely to the spell of Hildebrand's commanding mind. His conduct on his return was sufficiently expressive. With cold determination he refused to hold any intercourse with his brother metropolitans, the excommunicated Siegfried and Hildorf of Cologne, and with the other bishops of Henry's party. Only by the express permission of the Pope would he venture into the infected presence of the excommunicated King himself, in order to give him good counsel. He shrank from the sin and contamination of eating with him or joining him in prayer. The contagion of fear and aversion spread into the palace of Henry. The ecclesiastics shrank away one by one, lest they should be defiled by the royal intercourse. To the King's repeated commands, to his earnest entreaties that they would return, they answered that it was better to lose the royal favor than endanger their souls.¹ The more ardent and resolute of Henry's party

¹ Lambert, sub ann.

were excited to the utmost fury ; they urged the King to draw at once the sword, committed to him, by God, to chastise the rebellious prelates and his other contumacious subjects.

But Henry felt the ebbing away of his strength. Every thing seemed blasted with a curse and turned against him. His last hold on the fears of the Saxons was that he still had in his power some of their more formidable leaders. He issued orders to use the utmost vigilance for their detention. Of these the most dangerous, and, as most dangerous, most hateful to Henry was Burchard, Bishop of Halberstadt, whom Henry determined to send to Hungary for safer custody. On his descent of the Danube a bold and adventurous partisan contrived the liberation of the bishop : Burchard found his way to Saxony. The King's measures began to be those of a man in utter despair, wild, inconsistent, passionate. He at once changed his policy. He determined to have the merit of granting freedom to those whom he could not hope to detain in prison. To the bishops of Magdeburg, Merseburg, and Meissen, to Duke Magnus and the Palatine Frederick, he sent word that, though by the laws of the empire he would be justified in putting them to death, yet out of respect for their exalted rank, he would not merely release them on the promise of their fidelity, but reward that fidelity with the utmost liberality. They met hypocrisy with hypocrisy, and solemnly swore fidelity. They were brought to Mentz to receive their liberation from Henry himself ; but he was defeated even in this measure.¹ A fray took place in the city between the followers of the Bishop of Bamberg and of a

Escape and
liberation of
Saxon pri-
soners.
June 24.

June 29.

¹ Lambert, sub ann.; Benzo, 33-36.

rival ecclesiastic; the prisoners escaped in the confusion.

An expedition into Saxony, through Bohemia, ended July. in total and disgraceful failure. The King, instead of quelling his rebellious subjects, only by good fortune effected an ignominious retreat, and fled to Worms.

Hildebrand in the mean time neglected none of his July 25. Letters of the Pope. own means of warfare, that warfare conducted not in the battle-field, but in the hearts and souls of men, which he felt himself to command, and knew how to sway to his purpose. Words were his weapons, but words which went to the depths of the human mind, and shook almost every living man with fear. There were two classes, the churchmen, and the vulgar, which comprehended the larger part of the human race; to both he spake the fit and persuasive language. He addressed a spiritual manifesto to all Christendom, but more especially to the bishops and clergy. He reverted to his former affection for Henry; the love with which even when a deacon he had warned his youth; he had continued his earnest admonitions in mature age. But Henry had only returned evil for good; had lifted up his heel against St. Peter. He commanded the bishops to urge the contumacious King to repentance, but "if he prefers the devil to Christ, and adheres to his simoniacal and excommunicated counselors, the bishops, the Pope himself, must manfully discharge their duty. They must enforce upon all, clergy and laity, the peremptory obligation of avoiding all intercourse whatever with the excommunicated; all intercourse which was death to the souls of those wretched men and to their own." ¹

¹ Regest. iv. 1

In a letter to Herman of Metz he presses this doctrine with more relentless rigor. “All who ^{July 25.} had communicated with the excommunicated ^{Aug 25.} king, if king he might be called, by that act had themselves incurred excommunication.” Such were the doctrines of him who assumed to represent the Prince of Peace! “But there were those who denied his right to excommunicate a king: though their folly deserved it not, he would condescend to answer.”¹ What then was his answer? One of the most audacious fictions of the Decretals; an extract from a charge delivered by St. Peter to Clement of Rome; the deposition of Childbert by Pope Zacharias; certain sentences of Gregory the Great intended to protect the estates of the Church, and anathematizing all, even kings, who should usurp them; finally the memorable example of St. Ambrose and Theodosius the Great. “Why is the King alone excepted from that universal flock committed to the guardianship of St. Peter? If the Pope may judge spiritual persons, how much more must secular persons give an account of their evil deeds before his tribunal? Think they that the royal excels the episcopal dignity? — the former the invention of human pride, the latter of divine holiness: the former ever coveting vain glory, the latter aspiring after heavenly life. ‘The glory of a king,’ St. Ambrose says, ‘to that of a bishop is as lead to gold.’ Constantine the Great took his seat below the lowest bishop, for he knew that God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.” — The humility of Hildebrand! He then peremptorily forbade all bishops to presume to grant absolution to Henry, or to enter into communion with him. “The consecration

¹ Licet pro magnâ fatuitate nec etiam eis respondere debemus.

of a bishop who communicates with the excommunicate is an execration.”

A third letter, to the German people, commanded Sept. 3. them, if the King did not immediately repent, dismiss his evil counsellors, acknowledge that the Church was not subject to him as a handmaid, but superior as a mistress, and abandon those usages which had been established in the spirit of pride against the liberty of the holy Church (the investiture), to proceed at once to the election of a new sovereign, a sovereign approved by the Pope. He anticipates the embarrassment of their oath sworn to the Empress Agnes. She, no doubt, when Henry shall be deposed, will give her consent; the Pope would absolve them from their oath.

The diet met at Tribur near Darmstadt. Thither Oct. 16. came Rudolph of Swabia, Otho of Saxony, Guelf of Bavaria, the two former rivals for the throne if it should be vacant by the deposition of Henry. All the old enemies, all the revolted friends, the bishops who had opposed, the bishops who had consented, some even who had advised his lofty demeanor towards the Pope, appeared drawn together by their ambition, by their desire of liberty or of power, by their fears and by their hopes of gain or advancement, by their conscientious churchmanship, or their base resolution to be on the stronger side. Already in Ulm, where the diet at Tribur had been agreed upon, Otho of Constance had made In September. his peace with the Church; the feeble Siegfried of Mentz did the same. The Bishops of Verdun, Strasburg, Liege, Munster, and Utrecht obtained easier absolution, some of them having from the first disapproved of the King's proceedings.

The legates of the Pope, Sighard Patriarch of Aqu-

leia, and Altman Bishop of Passau, whose life had been endangered in the suppression of the married clergy, with many laymen of rank who had embraced the monastic life, appeared to vindicate the Pope's right to excommunicate the King, and to sanction the election of a new sovereign. These men kept themselves in severe seclusion from all who, since his excommunication, had held the slightest intercourse by word or deed with the King. They avoided with equal abhorrence all who communicated, even in prayer, with married or simoniacal clergy.

For seven days the conclave sat in high and independent, and undisturbed deliberation on the crimes of the Emperor; the sins of his youth, ^{Diet at Tribur.} by which he had disgraced the majesty of the Empire, the injuries which he had inflicted on individuals and on the public weal; his devotion to base-born counselors, and his deliberate hostility to the nobles of the realm; his having left the frontiers open to barbarous enemies, while he was waging cruel war on his subjects; the state of the Empire which he had inherited flourishing in peace and wealth, but which was now in the most wretched condition, laid waste by civil wars; the destruction of churches and monasteries and the confiscation of their estates for the maintenance of a lawless army; and the building fortresses to reduce his free-born liegemen to slavery: widows and orphans were without protection; the oppressed and calumniated without refuge; the laws had lost their authority, manners their discipline, the Church her power, the State her dignity. Thus by the recklessness of one man things sacred and profane, divine and human, right and wrong, were in confusion and anarchy. For these

great calamities one remedy alone remained, the election of another king, who should restrain the general license, and bear the weight of the tottering world. The right of the Pope to separate the King from the communion of the faithful was fully recognized; even if the Pope had passed such sentence unjustly, no Christian could communicate with the interdicted person till reconciled to the Church.

On the other side of the Rhine, at Oppenheim, the Henry at
Oppenheim. deserted Henry, with a few armed followers, a very few faithful nobles, and still fewer bishops, kept his diminished and still dwindling court. The Rhine flowed between these strangely contrasted assemblies. The vigor of Henry's character seemed crushed by the universal defection. There was no dignity in his humiliation. Even with his imperfect sense of kingly duty, and his notions of kingly power, the terrible truth of some of these accusations may have depressed his conscience. Whatever his offences against the Pope, he could not wonder at the alienation of his subjects. He sank to abject submission. Day after day came his messengers offering concession on concession, the redress of all grievances, the amendment of all errors, the promise to efface by his future benefits the memory of all past injuries. He was ready to do no public act without consulting the great Council of the realm; he would even surrender up his power, place the government in other hands, if they would leave him the royal name and dignity, which could not be taken away without degrading the crown of Germany in the eyes of men. For the fulfilment of these terms he offered any oaths and any hostages demanded by the Diet.

The conclave coldly replied that they could have no faith in his promises ; on every favorable opportunity he had broken like spiders' webs, the solemn oaths which he had pledged before God. They had been patient too long. Their religious reverence for their allegiance had made them endure the dissolution of all order in the state, the loss of peace in all the churches of the realm, the majesty of the empire subverted, the dignity of the public morals debased, the laws suspended, the ruin of justice and piety. As long as his temporal life was concerned, they had borne all this out of respect for their oath of fealty ; but now that he was cut off by the sentence of the Pope from the Church of God, it would be madness not to seize the hour of deliverance. It was their fixed determination, therefore, without delay to provide " a man to go before them, and to wage the war of the Lord," to the destruction of his pride who had lifted himself against the justice and truth of God and the authority of the Roman Church.

The treacherous Archbishop of Mentz had given orders to collect all the boats upon the Rhine, in order to attack Henry at Oppenheim, to seize his person, disperse his followers, and by one decisive blow to end the contest. But the partisans of Henry and Henry himself drew courage from the desperate state of their affairs. They boldly manned the shores, and bade defiance to their enemies. The confederates shrank from the conflict ; some were not prepared for the last extremity of arms ; others, remembering Hohenburg, might dread the issue of a battle even at such advantage. But this was a transient gleam of courage and success ; the consciousness of his weakness returned ; Henry was at the mercy of his revolted subjects. He had but to

accept the hard terms which they might be pleased to impose. The terms were these: the whole affair was to be reserved for the decision of the supreme Pontiff, who was to hold a council at Augsburg on the feast of the Purification in the ensuing year. In the mean time Henry was to declare his unreserved subjection and submission to the Pope, to dismiss his army, and live as a private man at Spires, with no ensigns of royalty, performing no act of kingly authority, not presuming to enter a church, and holding no intercourse with his excommunicated counsellors. He was to deliver the city of Worms to its bishop, to disband the garrison, and to bind the citizens by an oath to commit no act of insult or rebellion against their prelate. If the King was not absolved from the ban of excommunication before the full year expired from the date of his sentence (in that same month of February in which fell the feast of the Purification), he forfeited irrevocably all right and title to the throne; his subjects were released from their allegiance.

Henry bowed his head before his fate. He dismissed his counsellors; the Bishops of Cologne, Strasbourg, Bamberg, Basle, Spires, Lausanne, Zeitz, and Osnaburg were left to make their peace as they could with the Pope. Even his favorite counts, Ulric of Cosheim, and Eberhard of Nellenburg, were obliged to depart. He disbanded his troops, yielded up faithful Worms to its triumphant bishop, retired to Spires, and he who had been born, as it were, a king, who could have had no recollection of the time in which he was not honored with the name and ensigns of royalty, sank into a private station.

Henry
submits.

Beginning of
November.

But in that intolerable condition he could not re-

main ; he must determine on his future course. Whatever might be the end, it was better to confront the inexorable Pope ; to undergo, if it must be undergone, the deep humiliation of submission in Italy, rather than in the Diet of the Empire, in the face, amid the scorn and triumph, of his revolted subjects. He resolved to anticipate the journey of the Pope to Germany. Udo of Treves, his adversary, consented to be his messenger to solicit the Pope's permission to make his act of submission in Rome rather than at Augsburg. Udo's journey was stopped at Piacenza ; the enemies of Henry had anticipated his message to the Pope. Hildebrand declared his intention to hold the court at Augsburg ; however difficult and inconvenient the journey, before the 8th of January he should be at Mantua.

Nature seemed to conspire with the Pope and with his enemies against the fallen King. So hard a winter had not been known for years ; from Martinmas to the middle of April the Rhine was frozen, so as to be passable on foot. The Dukes of Bavaria and Carinthia, the enemies of Henry, commanded and jealously watched the passes of the Alps. A few days before Christmas. With difficulty Henry collected from still diminishing partisans sufficient money to defray the expenses of his journey. With his wife and infant son, and one faithful attendant, he left Spire, and turned aside into Burgundy, in hopes of finding hospitality and aid. He reached Besançon before Christmas day. William of Burgundy entertained him with courtesy.¹ He passed Christmas in Besançon with something approaching to royal state. From Besançon he made his way to Geneva, and crossed the Rhone, to the foot of Mont Cenis. There he was

¹ Satis magnifice pro suâ calamitate susceptus et habitus.

met by his mother-in-law, Adelaide, the powerful Marchioness of Susa, and her son Amadeus. They received him with an outward show of honor ; but, taking advantage of his extreme necessity, they demanded the cession of five rich bishoprics as the price of his free passage through their territories. This demand might seem an insidious endeavor to commit him still further with the Pope, by forcing him to exercise or to transfer, in a simoniacal manner, the contested power of investiture. Henry was glad to extricate himself by the sacrifice of a rich district which he possessed in Burgundy.

But the Alps were still between him and Italy. The passage of Mont Cenis, notwithstanding the hardier habits of the time, was always a work of peril and difficulty ; the unusual severity of the winter made it almost desperate. Vast quantities of snow had fallen ; the slippery surface, where it had hardened, was not strong enough to bear ; the ascent seemed impracticable. But the fatal day was hastening on ; the King must reach Italy or forfeit his crown forever. At Henry passes the Alps. a large cost they hired some of the mountaineers well acquainted with the paths, to go before and cut something like a road through the snow for the King and his few followers. So they reached with great labor the summit of the pass. The descent seemed impossible ; it looked like a vast precipice, smooth, and almost sheer. But the danger must be overcome ; some crept down on their hands and knees ; some clung to the shoulders of the guides, and so sliding and at times rolling down the steeper declivities, reached at length the bottom without serious accident. The queen and her infant son were drawn down in the skins of oxen, as in sledges. Some of the horses were lowered

by various contrivances — some with their feet tied allowed to roll from ledge to ledge. Many were killed, many maimed ; few reached the plain in a serviceable state.

No sooner was the King's unexpected arrival made known in Italy, than the princes and the bishops assembled in great numbers, and received him with the highest honors ; in a few days he found himself at the head of a formidable army. The great cause of his popularity with so many of the Lombard nobility and the prelates, was the notion that he had crossed the Alps to depose the Pope. All, and they were neither few nor without power, who were excommunicated by Hildebrand, looked eagerly for vengeance. But Henry could not pause to plunge into this new warfare, where even in Lombardy he would have encountered half the magnates and people. He could not imperil the throne of Germany. He must obtain the absolution from his excommunicator before the fatal 25th of February.

The Pope meantime, accompanied by his powerful protectress, Matilda of Tuscany, and by the Bishop of Vercelli, had crossed the Apennines on his way to Mantua. The news of Henry's descent into Italy arrested his march. Uncertain whether he came as a humble suppliant or at the head of an army (Gregory well knew the state of Lombardy), he immediately turned aside, and took up his abode in Canosa, a strong fortress belonging to Matilda.

To Canosa first came in trembling haste many of the nobles and prelates who had been included under the ban of excommunication, and whom Henry had been forced to dismiss from his service. Most of them had been so fortunate as to elude the guards set to watch

the passes of the Alps. Dietrich, Bishop of Verdun, one of the most faithful and irreproachable of Henry's partisans (he had not concurred in his more violent proceedings), had been seized by Adelbert, Count of Calw, plundered, imprisoned, forced to promise a large ransom, and not to revenge this cruel outrage. Rupert of Bamberg, still more odious to the adverse party, was taken by Guelf, Duke of Bavaria, stripped of all his treasures, even to his pontifical robes, and kept in close captivity; neither his own entreaties nor those of his friends could obtain his liberation. With naked feet, and in the garb of penitents, the rest appeared before the Pope. To them Gregory tempered his severity by mildness. He would not refuse absolution to those who confessed and lamented their sins; but they must be purified as by fire, lest by too great facility of pardon, the atrocious and violent crime of which they had been guilty to the apostolic see, should be regarded as a light sin, or as no sin at all. The bishops were shut up in separate and solitary cells, with but a scanty supply of food till the evening. The penance of the laity was apportioned with regard to their age and strength. After this ordeal of some days, they were called before the Pope, and received absolution, with a mild rebuke, and repeated injunctions to hold no communion with their master till he should be reconciled to the Holy See.

The lenity of the Pope to his adherents may have decided the wavering mind of Henry; it may have been designed to heighten by contrast the haughty and inexorable proceedings towards the King. Hildebrand would be content with the moderate chastisement of the inferiors, from the King he would exact the most degrading humiliation. Henry first obtained an inter-

view with Matilda of Tuscany. He sent her to the Pope, loaded with prayers and promises. She was accompanied by Adelaide of Susa, the Marquis Azzo, and Hugh, the Abbot of Clugny,¹ who was supposed to possess great influence over the mind of Gregory. He entreated the Pope not too rashly to credit the jealous and hostile charges of the German princes, but to absolve the King at once from his excommunication. The Pope coldly replied, that it was inconsistent with the ecclesiastical laws to pass judgment, except in the presence of the accusers; "let him appear on the appointed day at Augsburg, and he shall receive rigid and impartial justice." The ambassadors of Henry urged that the King by no means declined, he humbly submitted to the judgment of the Pope, but in the mean time earnestly desired to be released from the excommunication. The possession of his crown depended on his immediate absolution; he would undergo any penance, and be prepared to answer hereafter before the Pope to any charges advanced against him. The implacable Pope would yield no step of his vantage ground. He might indeed dread the versatility of Henry's character, and his ready assent to the advice of flattering and desperate counsellors. "If he be truly penitent, let him place his crown and all the ensigns of royalty in my hands, and openly confess himself unworthy of the royal name and dignity." This demand seemed too harsh even to the ardent admirers of the Pope; they entreated him to mitigate the rigor of the sentence, "not to break the bruised reed." The Pope gave a vague assent to their representations.²

¹ Hugh of Clugny had been the godfather of Henry. — *Dach. Spic.* iii. p. 441.

² It is fortunate that this scene, the most remarkable in the history of

On a dreary winter morning, with the ground deep in snow, the King, the heir of a long line of emperors, was permitted to enter within the two outer of the three walls which girded the castle of Canosa. He had laid aside every mark of royalty or of distinguished station ; he was clad only in the thin white linen dress of the penitent, and there, fasting, he awaited in humble patience the pleasure of the Pope. But the gates did not uncloze. A second day he stood, cold, hungry, and mocked by vain hope. And yet a third day dragged on from morning to evening over the unsheltered head of the discrowned King. Every heart was moved except that of the representative of Jesus Christ. Even in the presence of Gregory there were low deep murmurs against his unapostolic pride and inhumanity.¹ The patience of Henry could endure no more ; he took refuge in an adjacent chapel of St. Nicolas, to implore, and with tears, once again, the intercession of the aged Abbot of Clugny. Matilda was present ; her womanly heart was melted ; she joined with Henry in his supplications to the Abbot. "Thou alone canst accomplish this," said the Abbot to the Countess. Henry fell on his knees, and in a passion of grief entreated her merciful interference. To female entreaties and influence Gregory at length yielded an ungracious permission for the King to approach his presence. With bare feet, still in the garb of penitence, stood the King, a man of singularly tall and noble person, with a countenance

the middle ages, is related by that one of the monkish annalists who aspires to the character of a historian — Lambert of Hertzfeld.

¹ Nonnulli vero in nobis non apostolicæ severitatis gravitatem, sed quasi tyrannicæ feritatis crudelitatem esse clamarunt. These are Gregory's own words in his public account of the affair. — Ad Germanos. Regest. iv. 12

accustomed to flash command and terror upon his adversaries, before the Pope, a grey-haired man bowed with years, of small unimposing stature.

The terms exacted from Henry, who was far too deeply humiliated to dispute any thing, had no redeeming touch of gentleness or compassion. He was to appear in the place, and at the time which the Pope should name, to answer the charges of his subjects before the Pope himself; if it should please him to preside in person at the trial. If he should repel these charges, he was to receive his kingdom back from the hands of the Pope. If found guilty, he was peaceably to resign his kingdom, and pledge himself never to attempt to seek revenge for his deposition. Till that time he was to assume none of the ensigns of royalty, perform no public act, appropriate no part of the royal revenue which was not necessary for the maintenance of himself and of his attendants; all his subjects were to be held released from their oath of allegiance; he was to banish forever from his court Rapert, Bishop of Bamberg, and Ulric, Count of Cosheim, with Terms of submission. his other evil advisers; if he should recover his kingdom, he must rule henceforward according to the counsel of the Pope, and correct whatever was contrary to the ecclesiastical laws. On these conditions the Pope condescended to grant absolution, with the further provision that in case of any prevarication on the part of the King on any of these articles, the absolution was null and void, and in that case the princes of the empire were released from all their oaths, and might immediately proceed to the election of another king.

The oath of Henry was demanded to these conditions, to his appearance before the tribunal of the Pope, and

to the safe conduct of the Pope, if he should be pleased to cross the Alps. But the King's oath was not deemed sufficient; who would be his compurgators? The Abbot of Clugny declined, as taking such oath was inconsistent with his monastic vows. At length the Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Vercelli, Osnaburg, and Zeits, the Marquis Azzo, and others of the princes present, ventured to swear on the holy reliques to the King's faithful fulfilment of all these hard conditions.

But even yet the unforgiving Hildebrand had not forced the King to drink the dregs of humiliation. He had degraded Henry before men, he would degrade him in the presence of God; he had exalted himself to the summit of earthly power, he would appeal to Heaven to ratify and to sanction this assumption of unapproachable superiority.

After the absolution had been granted in due form, the Pope proceeded to celebrate the awful mystery of the Eucharist. He called the King towards the altar, he lifted in his hands the consecrated host, the body of the Lord, and spoke these words: — “ I have been accused by thee and by thy partisans of having usurped the Apostolic See by simoniacal practices, — of having been guilty, both before and after my elevation to the Episcopate, of crimes which would disqualify me for my sacred office. I might justify myself by proof, and by the witness of those who have known me from my youth, whose suffrages have raised me to the Apostolic See. But to remove every shadow of suspicion, I appeal from human testimony to divine. Behold the Lord's body; be this the test of my innocence. May God acquit me

The Sacrament at Canosa.

by his judgment this day of the crimes with which I am charged ; if guilty, strike me dead at once." He then took and ate the consecrated wafer. A pause ensued. he stood unscathed in calm assurance. A sudden burst of admiration thrilled the whole congregation. When silence was restored, he addressed the King, "Do thou, my son, as I have done ! The Princes of the German Empire have accused thee of crimes heinous and capital ; such as in justice should exclude thee not only from the administration of public affairs, but from the communion of the Church, and all intercourse with the faithful to thy dying day. They eagerly demand a solemn trial. But human decisions are liable to error ; falsehood, dressed out in eloquence, enslaves the judgment ; truth, without this artificial aid, meets with contempt. As thou hast implored my protection, act according to my counsel. If thou art conscious of thy innocence, and assured that the accusations against thee are false, by this short course free the Church of God from scandal, thyself from long and doubtful trial. Take thou too the body of the Lord, and if God avouches thy innocence, thou stoppest forever the mouths of thy accusers. I shall become at once the advocate of thy cause, the asserter of thy guiltlessness, thy nobles will be reconciled to thee, thy kingdom restored, the fierce tumult of civil war which destroys thy empire be allayed forever." ¹

Was this a sudden impulse or a premeditated plan of Gregory ? Was it but a blind determination to push

¹ Waltram either knows nothing of this part of the scene or passes it over. *Ad comprobandum ecclesiasticę reconciliationis testimonium, sacram communionem corporis et sanguinis Domini de manu ejus accepit. — De Unit. Eccles. ii. 15.* But he attributes this almost diabolical speech to Gregory, as addressed to Henry's enemies, *ne solliciti sitis, quoniam culpabiliorem eum reddo vobis.*

his triumph to the utmost ; or was it sincere confidence in the justice and certainty of this extraordinary ordeal ? Had he fully contemplated the dreadful alternative which he offered to the King — either boldly to deny the truth, to the smallest point, of charges not like those against himself, clear and specific, but vague, undefined, including his whole life ? In that case, did he not discern the incredible wickedness of thus tempting the King, in his stupor and confusion, to reckless perjury ? Or should the King, so adjured, prostrate himself at the feet of the Pope, and by acknowledging his guilt, deprive himself at once and forever of his crown ? Or did he suppose that God would indeed interpose, and as tradition reported of Lothair of Lorraine who had been put to the same test by Hadrian II. and met with a speedy and miserable death, so would the perjured Henry, by a still more striking example, rivet forever the bonds of ecclesiastical power upon the hearts of kings ?

Henry, in his amazement, hesitated, and stood in visible agitation. He then retired to a short distance to consult with his few followers how he should escape this terrible “ judgment of God.” He then summoned his courage, and declared that he must first obtain the opinion of those princes who had adhered to his cause ; that though this trial might be satisfactory to the few present, it would not have any effect on the obstinate incredulity of his absent enemies : he adjured the Pope to reserve the whole question for a General Council, in whose equitable decision he would acquiesce. The Pope hardly consented to this request ; but as if conscious that he had himself gone too far, he now condescended to receive the King at a banquet, treated him with courtesy, and gave him much grave advice.

Gregory had sent, in the mean time, Eppo, Bishop of Zeitz, to announce to the Italian nobles, the absolution of the King. But the Lombards had come not to see the King, but the Pope humbled. When they heard the history of Henry's debasement, they broke out into furious indignation, glared on the Bishop with fierce and menacing looks, and loaded him with insulting and contumelious language. They openly avowed their contempt for the Pope's excommunication, denied his right to the Papacy, renewed all the opprobrious accusations of adultery and other capital offences against the Pontiff. Of the King they spoke with contemptuous bitterness; he had dishonored the royal dignity by his submission to a man, a heretic and loaded with infamy; they had followed him as the avenger of their wrongs, as the asserter of justice and of ecclesiastical law; he had deserted them in the hour of trial, and made his own peace by a base and cowardly reconciliation. Their angry discontent spread through the camp. There was a general cry that the King should be compelled to abdicate the throne of which he was so unworthy, and that his son Conrad should be instantly proclaimed. With him at their head they would march to Rome, elect another Pope, who should crown the infant Emperor, and annul all the acts of this apostate Pontiff.

Henry sunk at heart, and perhaps now imagining that he had underrated his own power, did not dare to confront the tumult. He sent out some of the nobles around him to assuage the dissatisfaction, to explain the stern necessity to which he had bowed, and to assure them that hereafter he would apply all his thoughts to the assertion of their rights. The tumult was stilled;

but many of the more powerful Lombards retired in disgust to their strongholds. The rest received him as he came forth from the fatal Canosa with cold and Jan. 28. averted looks: no one approached him, but they stood apart in small knots, discussing, in hardly suppressed murmurs, his weakness and his disgrace. He retired in shame and sorrow to Reggio.

The triumph of sacerdotal Christianity, in the humiliation of the temporal power, was complete, but it was premature. Hildebrand, like other conquerors, must leave the fruits of his victory to later times. He had established in the face of Europe the great principle, the Papal power of judging Kings. Henry himself seemed at first stunned by the suddenness, the force of the blow; Christendom had in like manner been taken by surprise. But the pause of awe and reverence was but brief and transitory; a strong recoil was inevitable; the elements of resistance were powerful, and widely spread. The common hatred of Hildebrand brought together again all who, from lower or from loftier motives, abhorred his tyranny; the Germans, who resented the debasement of the Empire; the Italians, who dreaded the ascendancy of the house of Tuscany; the clergy, who, more or less conscientiously, were averse to the monastic rigor of Hildebrand — those who had felt or who dreaded his censures.

CHAPTER III

CONTINUED STRIFE WITH KING HENRY. BERENGAR OF
TOURS. DEATH OF GREGORY.

AROUND the fallen King in Reggio assembled almost all the distinguished prelates and laity who had formed his small court at Oppenheim. ^{Henry in Reggio} They were released from their excommunication, and prepared, with greater prudence, perhaps, but with unmitigated hostility, to resume the contest. Liemar Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Zeitz, Osnaburg, Lausanne, and Basle, Ulric of Cosheim, Eberhard of Nellenburg, and Berthold, the proscribed counsellors of the King; above all, Guibert of Ravenna, whose ambition aspired to the seat of Hildebrand, with many other Italian bishops.

The two parties remained for a time watching, it might seem, each other's movements; neither could trust the other. Henry, still wearing the outward show of submission, advanced from Reggio to Ravenna. There he sent a message to the Pope, requesting that the General Council might be held in Mantua rather than in Augsburg. To this Gregory, dreading, perhaps, the passage of the Alps, and uncertain or unwilling to commit himself too far with the German adversaries of the King, now he had withdrawn the excommunication, gave an ambiguous assent. Henry, after an interview

with his mother at Piacenza, where he was said to have held secret and nightly conferences with the enemies of Gregory, approached Mantua.¹ But either secret intelligence, or not unnatural suspicion that Henry had laid a deep plot to surprise the person of the Pope in that city, alarmed the partisans of Gregory.

A.D. 1077.
March 1.

Matilda hurried the Pope back, through by-roads, to the Apennines; and again entrenched him in her impregnable fortress at Canosa. Henry, during this time, was making a progress through the cities of Lombardy. Everywhere he encountered the same sullen and contemptuous indignation. There were no deputations of the magistrates — no processions of the people to meet him; the gates were closed; he was left to lodge in the suburbs. Provisions were doled out just sufficient for his maintenance, but altogether unbecoming his royal station; guards were posted to watch his followers, lest they should dare to maraud in the neighboring villages. Henry beheld all this not without some satisfaction; if it showed aversion and contempt for him, it showed still more profound hatred of the Pope. From Monza he sent to demand permission for

End of
February

his coronation as King of Italy by certain other bishops, the Archbishop of Milan and the bishop of Pavia being still under the Papal interdict. Gregory eluded this request, which might have the appearance of a public acknowledgment of Henry's still unquestioned, uncontested title to his crown.

Slowly, as he felt his growing strength, Henry began

¹ According to Berthold Henry was to have been visited at Pavia by the famous Cencius, who surprised Gregory in Rome. The king refused him the kiss as being excommunicate! Cencius died the day they were to have met, *morte damnandus æternâ*. In *puncto descendit ad inferna*, adds Berthold, sub ann. 1077.

to throw off the ill-worn mask of submission. He inveighed publicly against the harshness — Henry grows in power. the tyranny of the Pope. He openly reinstated his old counsellors, especially the obnoxious Ulric of Cosheim; he was in more and more open communication with the declared foes of the Pope; still there was no outward breach to justify Hildebrand in renewing the excommunication — in declaring the solemn and hard-wrung absolution null and void; and Henry was now too strong to be safely driven to despair. He was in Italy amid potentates ready to hazard every thing in their own cause — not in his; not in Germany with almost the whole empire in rebellion.

The revolted German Princes had gone too far to retreat. The few who aspired to the throne — the many who dreaded the vengeance of Henry — the Dukes of Swabia, Bavaria, and Carinthia, with some of the Saxon chiefs; Siegfried of Mentz, who was now too deeply committed, the Hildebrandine Bishops of Wurtzburg and Metz — had no course but to advance boldly to the deposition of the King. Beginning of February. They had met at Ulm, but the unusual cold of the season compelled them to disperse. The snow had prevented the arrival of many. They appointed the decisive Diet on the 13th of March at Forcheim.

For Gregory the position of affairs had become embarrassing to the utmost. By his severity, Embarrassment of the Pope. not merely had he not conciliated, he had degraded too deeply for reconciliation — debased, trampled upon the King. Christian forgiveness might seem to be too high a virtue to be expected from any man after such an example of implacability, least of all from a king like Henry. But yet he had released him from

the ban of excommunication. Before the appointed day of trial Henry stood absolved; the fact was public and notorious, the conditions hardly known or forgotten. The magician had dissolved his own spell. The strong ground on which the adversaries of Henry stood crumbled beneath them; they had lost the great excuse which justified them in the eyes of men for their revolt, for the deposition of Henry, for the election of a new King. Gregory conducted himself with that subtle policy in which he was as great a master as in bold resolve. He left free course to the fears and passions of the Germans hostile to Henry, yet took no step which would prevent him from disclaiming, in the face of the world, the election of Rudolph, now put openly forward as the intended successor of the deposed Henry.

Sept. 16,
1077.

He retired to his safer sanctuary at Rome, where he resumed his state. Count Maingold, the brother of the historian Herman the Lame, had been despatched to Gregory with the account of the proceedings at Ulm, and a respectful invitation to the

March 1.

Pope to attend in person at the Diet at Forcheim. The Pope sent a message to the confederate Princes, advising them to delay (if it could be done without danger, of which he would not take the responsibility) their final decision concerning the throne. At the same time he sent Count Maingold to Henry, to demand a safe-conduct for himself across the

About
March 7.

Alps. This was to be the test of Henry's fidelity. At the same time with the embassy of the Pope, Henry had received a summons to Forcheim, and also an insidious admonition from his rival Rudolph, not to enter into Germany until his mother or the Pope should have prepared the way for his reception.

Henry met subtlety with subtlety. He excused himself from appearing at Forcheim on the appointed day. "He had newly taken upon himself the functions of King of Italy; he was overwhelmed with business. The Italians would be offended at his sudden departure before he had settled their affairs." To Gregory he replied that it was beyond his ability to pledge himself for the security of the Pope; he was himself in the power of the Lombards, of whose profound hatred Gregory was aware. These ungovernable men might not respect his safe-conduct, and he might but be betraying the Pope into personal danger. Gregory did not think fit to question the truth or sincerity of these representations. He sent his two legates — the Abbot Bernhard of Marseilles, and Bernhard the Cardinal Deacon — as his representatives to the Diet.

The Diet met at Forcheim; the Papal Legates appeared. They made at first some show of ^{Diet at Forcheim.} moderation, which soon gave way before the ^{March 13.} resolute and not unexpected determination of the confederates to proceed at once to the election of a new Sovereign. The Legates mildly suggested the expediency of giving Henry another chance, and of awaiting the arrival of the Pope; but, with convenient modesty, they intimated doubts whether it could be done without danger. With the same unusual deference, they said that the possession of the throne depended not on their counsels, but on the decision of the Princes: it was for the Princes to judge what was best for the public weal: ¹ but they expressed their astonishment that the German

¹ Si hoc sine periculo fieri posse perpendarent. Bernried. Caterum provisionem regni non tam in eorum consilio, quam in principum arbitrio sitam. — Ibid

nation should so long have endured such a King. Determined, though the Legates of the Pope thus dexterously shrunk from responsibility, to have the Pope's name on their side, the confederates declared that before, and independent of Henry's excommunication, Gregory had annulled their oaths of allegiance; themselves would be under the Apostolic censure if they should remain any longer subject to the King.

The election fell upon Rudolph of Swabia; the Papal Legates interfered to assuage some fierce jealousies which threatened to break out among the rival Princes. Among the terms to which Rudolph swore was — I., to leave the choice of the Bishops free; and II., not to endeavor to make the throne hereditary in his family. He was at once consecrated at Mentz by Archbishop Siegfried and the Archbishop of Magdeburg. The Papal Legates gave the sanction of their presence to the ceremony.

Thus was civil war proclaimed throughout Germany. A writer on the Imperial side describes its guilt and misery. For seventeen years wars and seditions raged throughout the Roman Empire. Bishop rose against Bishop;¹ the clergy against the clergy; the people against the people; father against son, son against father, brother against brother. He deliberately charges Gregory with the guilt of all this unchristian fraternal hatred — of all this unchristian bloodshed.²

¹ In a battle (Aug. 7, 1078). The Saxon battle-word was St. Peter; but the bishops on St. Peter's side ran away. Quos omnes, quia melius sciebant psalmos cantare eo quod nutriti sub religione essent, quam legiones armatas ad bella disponere, solo visu præliantium in fugam conversi sunt. Magdeburg, in his flight, was killed by the peasants; Merseburg fled naked: Siegfried of Mentz (he was retaken); Bernard, Archdeacon of Rome, Adelbert of Worms, were brought before Henry. — Bruno, c. 96.

² Waltram de Unit. Eccles. apud Freber, p. 251. See, too, the very curi-

Is posterity to allow itself to be overawed by the grandeur of Gregory's character, his inflexible adherence to what he supposed to be right, his conscientious conviction that he was maintaining the cause of God — and to dismiss this grave contemporary charge from the bar of its judgment? To take refuge in the high predestinarianism that it was the inevitable collision of two great principles — that much eventual good arose out of the maintenance of the high ecclesiastical principle — does not solve the moral difficulty. It is not sufficient to say that the good survived and the evil passed away, — that the clergy maintained a power beneficial — greatly beneficial, on the whole, to civilization — while the earth drank up the blood that was shed, and the grave closed alike over those who suffered and those who inflicted misery. Was Gregory right in the assertion of the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power? Even if right, was civil war, with all its horrors, the legitimate means of maintaining it — legitimate to a Christian Pontiff? Was not Gregory, as the vicergerent of Christ, bound to have that deep abhorrence for human misery (and of the sins as well as the misery of civil war he could not be ignorant), so as to use

ous tract of Wipo, Bishop of Ferrara, published in the last volume of Pertz, *Scriptores*, pp. 148, 179 (1856), *De Schismate Hildebrandi*. It contains a discussion between an Imperialist and a Papalist, an enemy and an advocate of Hildebrand, in which his whole conduct is argued on as by plaintiff and defendant. The author sums at the end against Hildebrand in these words: *Duo sunt quæ dampnatione dignum Hildebrandum ostendunt: quod Rodolfum in regem creari fecit, et Teutonicum bellum fieri non prohibuit, in quo sanguis octo millium hominum fusus fuit. In eo etiam perjuri reatum incurrit, quod juramenti vinculis obligatos Teutonicos sacramenti religionem violare fecit. In eo etiam seismaticus extitit, quod indignorum ministrorum et excommunicatorum sacramenta polluta dedit, non accipienda mandavit, nec sacramenta quidem dici debere perhibuit, in quibus a sanctorum patrum regulis omnino dissensit.* P. 179.

every means to avert it? Did he attempt to allay the storm, or allow his own pride and passions to embark in it? Did not his subtle policy protract wilfully — knowingly protract for his own ends — the doubtful conflict? Were the liberties of the German people, the beneficent exercise of the power of the clergy — not the power itself — the leading incentives in his thoughts? How far was the supreme Christian law sacrificed, and by him who proclaimed himself Christ's representative on earth?

The inauguration of Rudolph was in blood. No sooner had he been crowned, than a fierce tumult broke out, from an accidental cause, between the followers of some of his partisans and those of Henry. Though they succeeded in restoring quiet, the Archbishop and the new King left the Imperial city, never to return.¹

It might seem that the assumption of the throne by a rival monarch called into action all the slumbering forces of Henry's cause. Now rallied the conviction that the royal authority was, no less than that of the Pope, the ordinance of God. Loyalty, submissive conscientious loyalty, had been the boasted attribute of the primitive Christians. The watchword of the party was that St. Peter himself had connected in indissoluble union the two unrepealable truths, "Fear God," and "Honor the King." The populace of Mentz had broken out in a sudden access of fidelity to the King. Rudolph and his followers next proceeded to Worms, but Worms again cast out her tyrannous and rebel bishop, and closed her gates. Everywhere a large part of the clergy, even in Swabia, refused to break their oath of fealty.

¹ Peractâ electione simul et sanguineâ illius ordinatione. — Waltram, p. 275.

The three Hildebrandine Bishops of Wurtzburg, Metz, and Passau, alone adhered to Rudolph: some, like Otho of Constance, at once declared for Henry; others, like Emmeric of Augsburg, only awaited a favorable time to renounce the Swabian cause.

No sooner had the news of the rival Emperor's election reached King Henry in Italy, than he sent to the Pope to demand Rudolph's excommunication as an unauthorized usurper. Gregory had recourse to his usual subterfuge — the injustice of condemnation without regular investigation of the cause.

Henry, with no longer delay than was necessary to collect some forces, which rapidly increased A. D. 1077. as he proceeded, left the care of his son Conrad and the government of Italy to the Bish- Henry in Germany. April and May. ops of Milan and Piacenza, and crossed the Alps. He was received with ardor by his partisans. Swabia first paid the penalty for the ambition of her prince. From the Necker to the Main all was laid waste. The fierce Bohemian half-pagan allies, who had joined the standard of Henry, treated churches with no more reverence than stables; women were violated on the altars. The war at once took its most ruthless and exterminating character.

The confederates looked in vain to Rome, which at least had not forbidden, which, it could hardly be denied, had fomented, had encouraged, had justified the rebellion.¹ Gregory now assumed the lofty tone of

¹ At the synod at Rome, March 3, 1078, Gregory anathematized the Archbishops of Ravenna and Milan, the Bishops of Cremona and Treviso, the Cardinal Hugo of St. Clement. He decreed as to the disturbances of the kingdom of Germany — *nuncii a latere apostolicæ sedis ad partes illas mittantur, qui omnes religiosos et justitiæ amantes, clericalis et laicalis ordinis viros convocent cum quibus aut finem aut pacem juste compo-*

arbiter, and commanded them to lay aside their arms, May 31. and await his sublime award. The Saxons addressed him in strong remonstrances; he had excited them to revolt by his excommunication of Henry; he had absolved them from their oaths, and now he affected to speak with equable impartiality. The heavens, they had thought, would stand still, earth move like the heavens, ere the throne of St. Peter would lose the firmness of Peter.¹ Thrice they wrote, in grief, in remonstrance, in indignation. Thrice must the cock crow to remind St. Peter of his weakness. At one juncture, indeed, the Legate, who had made Oct. 12, At Goslar. common cause with the confederates, ventured to renew the excommunication; he was neither avowed nor disclaimed by the Pope, and the interdict, therefore, had no great effect.

The character of Gregory cannot claim the excuse of irresolution. Yet for nearly two years did Hildebrand, while the war raged fiercely, maintain this doubtful policy, holding the language of peace, but claiming the right, which could not but be inadmissible, to dictate that peace. Wherever the final Council or Diet of the Empire was to meet and adjudicate on the conflicting titles of the two sovereigns, there he was to be present, to preside in person, or by his legates, and March, 1078. pronounce his award. Total submission to the Roman see was the first preliminary admitted in

nant, aut veritate percognitâ, cui parti magis justitia faveat, ad plenum addiscere valeant: quatenus pars injusta resipiscat et apostolicâ auctoritate munita justitia vigoris et auctoritatis robur obtineat. — Mansi, xx. p. 503. See, however, forward for further proceedings.

¹ Bruno. They complained that he was apostolici vigoris oblitus . . . at nostrates . . . a magnâ spe, quam in apostolicâ petrâ posuerant, exciderunt, quia prius cœlum stare, vel terram crediderunt cœli modo moveri, quam cathedram Petri amittere constantiam Petri. — c. 107.

the Court of the Pope. "If either of these Kings (thus he writes to the German nation), inflated by pride, shall in any way impede our journey to you, and conscious of his unjust cause, decline the judgment of the Holy Ghost, resisting in his disobedience his Holy Mother, the Catholic Church, him despise ye as a brood of anti-Christ, a destroyer of the Christian religion, and respect any sentence which our legates may pronounce against him. To those, on the other hand, who shall humbly submit to our judgment, pay all reverence and honor."¹

But Henry's submission to any arbitration, even if the scene at Canosa had not taught him mistrust of the Pope's equity, of the Pope's justice, had invalidated his title. That he was the actual, undeposed, undeposable King, his rival a rebel and an usurper, was the strength of his cause. Gregory's words of peace, therefore, however lofty, could not be expected even by himself to overawe the civil war, of which his own pretensions were one of the causes. His language, in-
Policy of Gregory.
 deed, was appalling enough. In a second
 address to the German nation, he anathematizes all who shall impede the assembling a general Diet to judge between the two kings, whether king, archbishop, duke, marquis, or of whatsoever station or dignity. Nor does he confine his denunciations to the remote spiritual state of the transgressor; he imprecates vengeance on his body as on his soul. "In all his acts may he feel (the imprecation, no doubt, was intended as a prediction) the vengeance of Almighty God; in every battle may he find his strength fail; March 3, 1078.
 may he never obtain a victory, but, prostrate

¹ Ad Germanos, iv. 24.

in humble contrition, be abased and confounded, till he is brought to true repentance." Such was the Papal address, sanctioned by a great synod at Rome.¹

But in the midst of this conflict with the temporal power, it might seem for the life or death of Papal, of
Feb. 11,
1079.
Berengar of
Tours. sacerdotal Christianity, the doctrinal antagonist of that power had risen again, still pertinaciously determined to know no defeat. Berengar of Tours demands another solemn condemnation. In vain had three Councils — at Paris, at Rome, at Vercelli — issued their decrees; Berengar either treated them with scorn, or with his subtle logic attempted to prove, that while they censured they acceded to his doctrines. He had recanted all his enforced recantations, or denied that he had in truth recanted. In vain had one Pope (Leo) committed himself, committed the Papal authority, to the actual censure; in vain his successors, Victor, Nicolas, Alexander, had at least acquiesced in the repudiation of the perilous tenet. In vain had Lanfranc, now Primate of Norman England, and esteemed among the first, if not the first, theologian of Christendom, promulgated his refutation. The mere fact that at such a crisis a new council must be held at Rome, that the heresiarch dares again appear to answer for his doctrine, manifests the obstinate vitality, if not the increasing power and expanding influence of Berengar.

But the conduct of Gregory at this council, his treatment of the great heresiarch, is in the strangest contrast with that to his imperial antagonist. Hildebrand, on all questions of Church power so prompt, decisive, instantaneous in his determinations; so impatient of op-

¹ Ibid. Regest. v. 15.

position, so merciless to a foe within his power; so pertinacious to crush out the last words of submission where he feels his superiority; so utterly, it should seem conscientiously, remorseless, when the most remote danger can be apprehended or warded off from the vast fabric of the theocracy, from the universal, all-embracing, as he hoped, eternal ecclesiastical dominion — is now another man. Compare Gregory VII. in the condemnation of Investitures and Gregory in defence of Transubstantiation: Gregory with King Henry at Canosa, and with Berengar at Tours, or at Rome. Hildebrand, it might almost seem for the first time, on this cardinal doctrine, is vacillatory, hesitating, doubtful. He will recur to the Blessed Virgin¹ to enlighten him, and the Blessed Virgin appears to acquit Berengar of any dangerous heresy.² He even bears the clamor of the populace.³

¹ Ego planè te de Christi sacrificio secundum Scripturas bene sentire non dubito, tamen quia consuetudinis mihi est ad B. Mariam de his que me movent, recurrere, ante aliquot dies imposui religioso cuidam amico, jeuniis et orationibus operam dare, atque ita a B. Maria obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret. How strange is this! The Pope propitiating the Virgin by another's fasts and prayers, and receiving the oracle, not directly, but through him. His religious friend heard from the Virgin — a B. Maria audivit — that Berengar's views were scriptural. This is Berengar's statement. — *Acta Berengarii*, Mansi, xix. p. 766.

² This vague oath of Berengar was accepted as orthodox. Profiteor panem altaris post consecrationem esse verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de Virgine, quod passum est in cruce, quod sedet ad dexteram Patris; et vinum altaris, postquam consecratum est, esse verum sanguinem qui manavit de latere Christi. Et sicut ore pronuncio, ita me corde habere confirmo, sic me adjuvet Deus et hæc sacra. There is no word of *transubstantiation*. Luther and the Anglican Church might subscribe this: perhaps even under the ambiguous *verum*, many other believers. Gregory not only declares that himself, but that Peter Damiani had rejected the views of Lanfranc. — *Berengarii Act.* Roman. Concil., Mansi, xix.

³ Berengar asserts that he lived a year with the Pope, who supposed that by this creed, and by the assertion of the authority of Damiani, he had restrained or silenced the rabble (*turba*), but his hopes were vain; the

He lays himself open to the bitter taunts which he must well have known that his enemies would seize every opportunity to heap upon him, to protect Berengar from an unjust or too rigorous sentence. He dismisses the heresiarch, it might seem uncondemned, or even with honor. Berengar, already censured by former Popes, bears with him in triumph recommendatory letters from Gregory VII.¹ Berengar dies in peace, in full possession of his ecclesiastical dignities.

Was it that from the first the bold, logical mind of Berengar at Tours had cast a spell upon Hildebrand? Was it a calm, stern sense of justice, which believed, and dared to assert, that Berengar's opinions had been misrepresented by his blind or malignant enemies? Was it that he was caught in the skilful web of Berengar's dialectics? Was his sagacity at fault for once; and was his keen foresight obtuse to the inevitable consequences which the finer instinctive dread of the greater part of the religious world felt to its very heart, that from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in its hardest, most material form, once defined, once avowed, once established by the decrees of Popes and Councils, there was no retreat without shaking the sacerdotal power to its base — that bolder men would inevitably either advance on Berengar's opinions, or teach undisguised that which Berengar concealed under specious phraseology? The priest's power, as it was afterwards intrepidly stated, of making God; the miracles which

tumult began again. *et ita circa quædam per Papæ inconstantiam* (is this Hildebrand?) *quod sperabat turba, rei exitus habuit.*

¹ *Literæ commendatitæ Gregorii VII. datæ Berengario, d'Achery Spicileg. iii. 413.* He anathematizes those who call Berengar, the son of the Roman Church, a heretic. Gieseler, ii. p. 1, p. 293-4, has quoted the passages with his usual accuracy and copiousness.

became, or had become so common, to prove, not the spiritual, but the grosser material transmutation, fell away at once: and with it how much of sacerdotal authority, sacerdotal wealth, sacerdotal dominion! — some might suppose of true and humble reverence for the mystery of the Eucharist! With the whole religion, now and for some centuries become materialism more or less refined, how perilous spiritualism in its holiest, most august rite! Gregory can hardly have supposed that by mildness, moderation, candor, he could propitiate to silence or to inactivity the busy, vain heresiarch. Be it as it may, Gregory had to bear, and he can hardly but have foreseen that he should have to bear, the reproach that he himself doubted the real presence of the body and blood of the Redeemer in the Sacrament — that he was an infidel.¹

In the same year with the council which arraigned Berengar, Gregory was reduced, by the in- October, 1079. creasing successes of Henry, to disavow his legates: the war went on, unheeding his commands, his rebukes, his menaces; even his thunders were drowned in the din of arms; fiercer passions had quelled for a time even religious fears.

It was not till the unwearied activity, enterprise, courage, and craft of Henry had given him great hopes of final triumph,² and the cause of Rudolph, from the divisions which Henry had artfully sowed among his formidable partisans the Saxons, seemed desperate, that

¹ *En verus pontifex et verus sacerdos qui dubitat, si illud quod sumitur in dominicâ mensâ, sit verum corpus et sanguis Christi.* So writes Egilbert, Archbishop of Treves. — In Eccard. C. H. Medii Ævi, ii. 170. *Jejunium indixit cardinalibus, ut Deus ostenderet, quis rectius sentiret de corpore Domini, Romanave ecclesia an Berengarius — dubius in fide, infidelis est.* — Benno. in Goldast, p. 3.

² Bonizo owns Henry to have been *magni consilii et mirabiliter sagax.*

Gregory abandoned his temporizing policy. Up to this time his ambition might still hope that he might be recognized by the two weary and exhausted parties as the irrefragable arbiter, in the Diet of Germany, of their quarrels ; and his prerogative of adjudicating the crown might be admitted in the face of Christendom by the consentient Teutonic nation.

But the low state of Rudolph's affairs compelled him now to a more decided course. To surrender Rudolph was to surrender himself. If he allowed Rudolph to be utterly crushed, the conqueror of Germany, the head of Northern Italy, with an army flushed with victory, and inured to contempt of things sacred, might descend, irresistible as Charlemagne or Otho, but with far other designs, on Rome ; scatter the Tuscans — win, perhaps, the Normans by a share of the plunder — the Normans whom Gregory now held in excommunication, and now in close alliance. A decision in favor of Henry would only increase his strength without in the least slaking his inveterate, treasured, long-provoked vengeance. Hildebrand's old resolution returned. He determined again to wield that weapon which had before served him with such tremendous force : he might almost seem to have reserved the last resource of excommunication for such a perilous crisis.

At Rome, with no solemn trial, on the earnest supplication of Rudolph's ambassadors, notwithstanding the hardy protests from those of Henry, the Archbishop of Bremen and the Bishop of Bamberg, the Pope proceeded again to this terrific sentence ; again he pronounced against King Henry the decree of excommunication — of deposition.

The Council commenced its proceedings with a

A.D. 1080.
March 7.
Henry again
excommunicated.

strong prohibition against lay investiture, against the acceptance of it by the clergy, the grant by the laity. It then went on to the excommunication of Tedaldo claiming to be Archbishop of Milan, against Guibert of Ravenna, and Roland Bishop of Treviso. The anathema against King Henry was worded with great care and solemnity. It began with prayer to St. Peter and St. Paul. It repeated the usual declaration of Gregory as to the reluctance with which he had entered into public affairs, and the compulsion which had forced him into the Papacy. It recited the former excommunication, the submission of Henry; declared that the Pope had taken no part in the election of Rudolph, but that Rudolph, thus freely elected, had professed unlimited obedience to the Roman See; that Henry likewise had implored his support against Rudolph; that he had consented to hold a council to decide on their conflicting claims, and anathematized all who should impede the meeting of that Council. The guilt of impeding the Council, and all the crimes and miseries of the civil war, are charged against Henry alone. "Wherefore, trusting in the justice and mercy of God, and of his blessed Mother, the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, on your authority (that of St. Peter and St. Paul), the above named Henry and all his adherents I excommunicate and bind in the fetters of anathema; on the part of God Almighty, and on yours, I interdict him from the government of all Germany and of Italy. I deprive him of all royal power and dignity. I prohibit every Christian from rendering him obedience as king. I absolve all who have sworn or shall swear allegiance to his sovereignty from their oaths.¹ In every battle may Henry

¹ Bernried shows the manner in which the papal power of deposing

and his partisans be without strength, and gain no victory during his life. And that Rudolph whom the Germans have elected for their king, may he rule and defend that realm in fidelity to you! On your part, I give and grant to those who shall faithfully adhere to the said Rudolph full absolution of all their sins, and in entire confidence blessing in this life and in the life to come. As Henry, for his pride, disobedience, and falsehood, is justly deposed from his royal dignity, so that royal power and dignity is granted to Rudolph, for his humility, obedience, and truth." The censure did not conclude without the personal sentence upon Henry. It proceeded to the broad, bold assertion of more than the absolute supremacy of the ecclesiastical over the civil power; it declared all possessions, all dignities, all powers, to be at the sole disposition of the Church. "Come, then, ye fathers and most holy prelates, let all the world understand and know, that since ye have power to bind and loose in heaven, ye have power to take away and to grant empires, kingdoms, principalities, duchies, marquisates, counties, and the possessions of all men according to their deserts. Ye have often deprived wicked and unworthy men of patriarchates, primacies, archbishoprics, bishoprics, and bestowed them on religious men. If ye then judge in spiritual affairs, how great must be your power in secular! and if ye are to judge angels, who rule over proud princes, what may ye not

kings was interpreted by his adherents. In all his extreme acts of power Gregory was under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. *Nemo autem Romanorum Pontificum Reges a regno deponere posse denegabit, quicunque decreta sanctissimi Papæ Gregorii non proscribenda judicabit. Ipse enim vir apostolicus, cui Spiritus Sanctus in aurem decernenda dictavit, in apostolicâ sede constitutus, irrefragabiliter decrevit reges a suis dignitatibus redere, et participatione Dominici corporis et sanguinis carere, si præsumerent jussa apostolicæ sedis contemnere.* — Vit. Gregor. vii. c. xcvii.

do to these their servants? Let kings, then, and all the princes of the world learn what ye are, and how great is your power, and fear to treat with disrespect the mandates of the Church; and do ye on the aforesaid Henry fulfil your judgment so speedily that he may know that it is through your power, not by chance, that he hath fallen — that he be brought to repentance by his ruin, that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord.”

Not content with this tremendous excommunication, Gregory ventured to assume the prophetic office. He declared publicly, and either believed himself, or wished others to believe, with the authority of divine revelation, that unless Henry made his submission before the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, the 29th of June, he would be deposed or dead; and if his vaticination failed, men were to cease to believe in the authority of Gregory.

War was thus declared. Gregory, it is said, sent a crown to Rudolph, with an inscription that it was the gift of St. Peter.¹ Henry and the Bishops of his party heard not now with cowering fear, with disordered minds, and distracted counsels, but with the strongest indignation — with the most resolute determination to run all hazards — the anathema of the Pope. It seemed to have lost all its terrors even on the popular mind: no defections took place: no desertions from the court, the council, or the army. All disclaimed at once further allegiance to Gregory. Henry, in a letter to Dietrich Bishop of Verdun, issued his commands that the princes and prelates of the em-

¹ *Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolfo.*

pire should be summoned to Mentz on the 31st of May, April 12. to depose the Pope, and to elect a new Head of the Church. At Mentz nineteen Bishops met, and with one voice determined to renounce Hildebrand as Pope. To this decree it was important to obtain the assent of the Lombard prelates. The Bishop of Spire crossed the Alps; the Archbishops of Milan and Ravenna assembled their suffragans at Brixen in the Tyrol.

June 25.
Gregory
deposed.

There, in a synod of thirty bishops, they confirmed the deposition of the false monk Hildebrand called Gregory VII.¹ To the charges of licentiousness, bribery, and disturbance of the peace of the empire, they added accusations of heresy and necromancy. "We assembled by the authority of God in this place, having read the letter from the synod of nineteen bishops held at Mentz against the licentious Hildebrand, the preacher of sacrilegious and incendiary doctrines; the defender of perjury and murder; who, as an old disciple of the heretic Berengar, has endangered the Catholic and Apostolic doctrine of the Body and Blood of Christ;² the worshipper of divinations and of dreams; the notorious necromancer; himself possessed with an evil spirit, and therefore guilty of departing from the truth; him we adjudge to be canonically deposed and expelled from his see, and

¹ Quod a sæculo non est auditum, ut tot uno tempore inimicus humani generis mente captos contra sanctam Romanam ecclesiam armasset episcopos. — Bonizo, p. 815.

² This charge no doubt arose from his acceptance of the ambiguous confession from Berengar, see p. 86; and no doubt much was made of the declaration which Berengar asserted him to have made, that he had received a special message from the Virgin Mary, testifying that the doctrine of Berengar was consonant with the Scriptures. — *Acta Concil. in caus. Berengar.*; Martene et Durand *Thesaur. Anecd.* iv. p. 103.

unless, on hearing our judgment, he shall descend from his throne to be condemned for everlasting." ¹

And now Guibert of Ravenna attained the object of his ambition: he was elected Pope by the ^{June 25.} unanimous voice of the assembly. But Chris- ^{Guibert} ^{Anti-pope.} tendom had submitted too long to the supremacy of Hildebrand to disbelieve or to question his title to the Popedom. This proceeding would appear to the world, not as a solemn decree of the Church, but as a passion-

1 IMPERIALIST PRELATES.

PAPALISTS.

Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, at first, then neutral, driven by his fears to be an ardent Hildebrandine after the excommunication.

Udo " " Treves, first Papalist, afterwards an Imperialist at the Elster.
Hildorf " " Cologne. Wozelin, Archbishop of Magdeburg, killed

1078.

Liemar " " Bremen.

Gebhard " " Salzburg.

Rupert, Bishop of Bamberg.

Burchard, Bishop of Halberstadt.

William " " Utrecht.

Wezel " " Hildesheim.

Eppo " " Zetz.

Adalbero " " Wurtzburg.

Otho " " Constance.

Herman " " Metz.

Burchard " " Lausanne.

Altman " " Passau.

Burchard " " Basil.

Adalbert " " Worms.

Henry " " Spire.

Werner " " Merseburg.

Werner " " Strasburg.

Emmeric " " Augsburg.

Poppo " " Toul.

Dietrich " " Verdun.

Hugh, Bishop of Lyons.

Banzo " " Osnaburg.

Saxon Insurgents.

Italians.

Italians

Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna.

Anselm, Bishop of Lucca.

Tedaldo " " Milan.

Gregory " " Vercelli.

William, Bishop of Pavia.

Otto " " Ostia.

Arnulf " " Cremona.

Reginald " " Como.

Alexander " " Piacenza.

" " Spoleto.

Grisforano " " Fermo.

Roland " " Treviso.

Cunibert " " Turin.

Siegfried " " Bologna.

Heribert " " Modena.

Elimpert " " Arezzo

Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino

ate act of revenge, inflaming both the King and the prelates to overstep their powers. It neither shook the faith of his partisans, nor strengthened in their animosity the enemies of Hildebrand. Guibert was probably more dangerous as Archbishop of Ravenna and Chancellor of Italy than as the Anti-pope Clement III.

The horrors of civil war might appear to be drawing to a close in Germany. The two armies met Battle of the Elster. for a decisive battle near the Elster. It might seem a religious no less than a civil war. Henry was accompanied to the battle by the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves and fourteen other prelates. The Saxons advanced to the charge, with the bishops of their party and the clergy chanting the eighty-second psalm, "God standeth in the congregation of the princes." At the first gleam of success, the army of Henry broke out into the "Te Deum laudamus," and when, after the great Oct. 13. reverse in the battle, their camp at Erfurt was surprised, they were singing a triumphant Kyrie Eleison. The defeat of Henry was more than counter-balanced by the fall of his rival. Rudolph, notwithstanding that he was the champion of the Pope, the subject of his triumphant vaticination, was Death of Rudolph. mortally wounded in the battle. Some misgivings as to the justice of his cause embittered his last moments. His hand had been struck off by a sabre: as he gazed on it, he said, "With this hand I ratified my oath of fealty to my sovereign Henry; I have now lost life and kingdom. Bethink ye, ye who have led me on, in obedience to whose counsels I have ascended the throne, whether ye have guided me right."

The death of Rudolph, though it did not restore peace to Germany — though the fatal strife was yet to

last many years — paralyzed the adversaries of Henry for a time, and gave him leisure to turn his forces against his more irreconcilable enemy.

In the spring of the year 1081 Henry crossed the Alps in far different condition from that in which four years before he had stolen, a de-^{Henry in Italy.}serted and broken-spirited suppliant, to the feet of the Pope. Gregory had been shown in the face of the world a false prophet: Heaven had ratified neither his anathema nor his predictions. Instead of his defeat and death, Henry came in the pride of conquest; and it was his adversary who had fallen, as his friends declared, by the manifest judgment of God, in the battle-field by the Elster. There was now no reluctance to follow him in a war which before seemed sacrilegious and impious; no desertion from his ranks — no defection from his councils.¹ All Lombardy was zealous in his cause: on the same day that the battle was fought on the Elster the troops of his partisans had defeated those of the Countess Matilda; the allegiance of her subjects was shaken.

The only protectors to whom Gregory could now look were the Normans; but even the Normans, on account of some border disputes about territories, which they refused to abandon at the word of the Pope, were under the ban of excommunication. With them, however, he made a hasty treaty, withdrawing May, 1081 the interdict on the first seeming concession, and condescended to leave in abeyance the contested claims to Fermo. But the Normans, instead of marching, as Gregory proposed, with the Pope at their head, against

¹ All the Italians, Gregory himself repeatedly says, were for Henry. — Regest. ix. 3.

July, 1081. Ravenna,¹ had embarked on a wild enterprise against the Greek empire, and were besieging Durazzo on the other side of the Adriatic.

Still Gregory was as firm in danger and adversity, as he had been imperious and disdainful in the height of his power. The very depth of his soul was filled with confidence in the justice of his cause, and the certainty of divine favor. The way to Rome lay open to the army of Henry; the Countess Matilda could not venture on resistance in the field; she retired for security to her fortresses in the Apennines. By Pentecost the Germans and Lombards might be at the gates of Rome, the Germans infuriated by the hard measure dealt to their master; the Lombards by religious as well as by civil animosity. But the inflexible Gregory refused all concession; he indignantly rejected the advice, the supplications of his adherents, at least to make a show of submission. Even at the time when the vengeance of Henry was rapidly advancing against his undefended foe, he renewed his most imperious proclamations; he wrote to the leader of his partisans in language even for him unprecedentedly bold and contemptuous. The secular power is no longer admitted, as with the sacerdotal, a coincident appointment of God. It has its origin in human wickedness and diabolic suggestion; in blind ambition and intolerable presumption; kingship is an audacious usurpation on the natural equality of man.²

¹ Epist. viii. 7.

² To Herman of Metz. Quis nesciat reges et duces ab iis habuisse principium, qui Deum ignorantes superbiâ, rapinis, perfidiâ, homicidiis, postremo universis pœne sceleribus, mundi principe diabolo scilicet aptante, *super pacis scilicet homines*, dominari cœcâ cupiditate et intolerabili præsumptione affectaverint. Are we reading a journalist of Paris in 1791? Every king, he proceeds, on his deathbed, as a humble and pitiful suppliant implores the

But Rome was under the absolute control of Gregory; it was not merely faithful, it was firm, ^{Gregory besieged in Rome.} united, courageous. Cencius had died in exile, and, though magnificently buried by Guibert of Ravenna, his faction seemed to have died with him. The city must have been well provisioned, the fortifications had been strengthened, and more than its outward strength, the old Roman energy and determination appears to have revived in the hearts of its defenders.¹

For three successive years Henry encamped under the walls of Rome, while the Pope within those impregnable walls, which the Germans did not venture at first even to attempt to storm, held him at defiance, and all this time the Romans, for once, maintained ^{May, 1081.} their fidelity. The wealth of Matilda, it is said, assisted in securing their loyalty.

Year after year, summer, by its intolerable heats, and by the sickness, which constantly spread among the German troops, relieved the Pope and his city from the presence of his enemies. In the ^{Three years' siege.} first year the army broke up in the beginning ^{July 7, 1081} of July; the next the siege or blockade lasted ^{Christmas, 1081, to Easter (April 24) 1082.} no longer than Easter. In the third ^{1083.} Henry lay encamped against the Leonine city, on the right

assistance of a priest to save him from the eternal dungeon of hell. Can a king baptize? Can a king make the body and blood of Christ by a word (*quis egrum potest proprio ore corpus et sanguinem Domini conficere?*) What king has ever wrought miracles (we say not as the apostles or the martyrs), but as St. Martin, St. Antony, or St. Benedict? Could Constantine, Theodosius, Honorius, Charles, or Louis, the most Christian kings? — Ibid.

¹ Two senators of Rome, according to Benzo, had been present in the Council at Brixen, and promised to surrender Rome. They termed the Pope's supporters "prevaricatores," but they admit that Gregory had *fascinated* the Romans. — *Introduct. ad Lib. vi. p. 1044.*

bank of the Tiber, from Christmas to the beginning of June. All his attempts to storm the city or to make a practicable breach in the walls had been in vain. An accident made him master of this part of Rome. While both parties were in profound repose, two followers of the Archbishop of Milan, stole under a part of the walls which had been slightly broken. They climbed up, found the sentinels asleep, killed them, got possession of a tower, and made a signal to the royal army, which advanced rapidly to their support. The Leonine city June 9, 1083. was thus lost; but the Pope threw himself into the castle of St. Angelo, and the whole of Rome on the left bank of the Tiber still defied the enemy.¹

The Romans at length grew weary of enduring the miseries of a siege; there seemed no hope of speedy relief from the Normans. The resources of Gregory, which as yet had been amply supplied by Matilda, began to fail. The Eastern Emperor Alexius, attacked in his own dominions by Robert Guiscard, had entered into close alliance with Henry, and supplied him with large sums of money, which were unscrupulously distributed among the wavering Romans.²

At this juncture negotiations were commenced, but with profound mistrust, and undissembled conviction that Henry on his side would observe no oaths. The Pope had openly asserted his own prerogative of releasing from all oaths. Henry offered to accept the imperial crown from the hand of Hildebrand. By this proposition he recognized the right of Gregory to the papal see, and threw aside his own anti-pope,

Negotiations,
July.

¹ Bernold. Chronicon. sub ann.

² Cumque pecuniâ et terrore et vi omnes fere sibi acquisivisset Romanos.
— Bonizo.

Guibert of Ravenna. But under this lurked subtle policy. If he accepted these terms, Gregory annulled at once all his former acts, pronounced his own excommunication unjust, and that he who had been declared unworthy to rule as king, was now fit to receive from the hands of the Pope the imperial crown. If he rejected these overtures, which wore the appearance of moderation, on him lay all the blame of the prolonged contest ; the charge of inexorably pursuing his own imperious views, even in these desperate times, at any cost of human bloodshed and misery, even at the hazard of endangering the Papacy itself.

Not less sagacious than intrepid and inflexible, Gregory maintained as lofty a tone as if Henry ^{Firmness of Gregory.} were still at his feet at Canosa. He demanded unconditional submission : “ Let the King lay down his crown, and give satisfaction to the Church.” The clergy and the laity — bishops, abbots, monks, entreated him to have mercy on the afflicted city. The Romans implored, clamored, murmured, menaced his unyielding obstinacy. Hildebrand despised alike supplications, murmurs, and menaces.

The Romans at length, at once assailed by bribes and fears, declared in favor of Henry. They took the management of the treaty into their own hands. The Pope was to summon a General Council for the middle of November ; the Emperor to grant safe-conduct to all who might attend it. Rome, in the mean time, was to observe a kind of independent neutrality. But the Roman leaders agreed, at the same time, on a separate, perhaps a secret article, that at the appointed time, either Gregory himself, or another Pope elected ^{The Romans waver.} for that purpose, should present Henry with

the imperial crown. They gave twenty hostages for the fulfilment of this treaty.

The troops of Henry were suffering from heat and from fevers. He hastily ran up a fort on a small hill called the Palatiolus, left a garrison of one hundred knights, with Ulric of Cosheim, which commanded the Leonine city, and departed to subdue the fortresses of Gregory's faithful ally the Countess Matilda.¹ He wasted Tuscany with fire and sword. The subjects of Matilda, even some of the strongest episcopal partisans of Hildebrand, began either openly to revolt, or to make separate terms with Henry. Adelheid, the Marchioness of Susa, attempted to negotiate a treaty between the King and the Papalist Countess. The Anti-Pope assailed her with flattering letters. But Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, counteracted all the intrigues of the royal party : he raised troops to revenge the burning of Matilda's castles by burning those of the chieftains who had revolted to the King. He bribed as boldly as he fought ; and if the womanly fears of Matilda, or her gentler feelings towards her afflicted subjects, had shaken her steadfast mind, she neither dared nor wished to shake off the commanding control of the martial Bishop.²

The Council met on the 20th of November ; but it was not a full assembly of stately prelates, but a few, and those exclusively of Hildebrand's party. Those who had already committed themselves, by acknowledging the Anti-Pope, could not obey the summons of Hildebrand, as they could hardly hope on his own

¹ Compare throughout Benzo apud Mencken. — Lib. vi.

² There is a Life, or rather a legend, of Anselm of Lucca, in Pertz, xiv. l.

ground to overbear him by numbers. They stood aloof; and moreover, the titles of most of these would have been called in question. Henry, on his side, foreseeing the predominance of the Papal party, prevented some of Hildebrand's avowed partisans, Anselm of Lucca, Hugh of Lyons, Reginald of Como, and Otto of Ostia, from approaching Rome. Gregory displayed his highest eloquence in his address to this assembly, which sate for three days in melancholy deliberation. He spoke, it is said, with the voice of an angel, not of a man; and the groans and sobs of almost all present acknowledged his still prevailing power over their hearts and minds. Their prudence, however, restrained them from repeating, in this trying hour, the sentence of excommunication. The censure of ^{Nov 20,} 1083, the Church was only uttered against those who had presumed to prevent the prelates from attending the council, and, as in the case of the Bishop of Ostia, to seize their persons.

But a more seasonable succor arrived: a gift of 30,000 pieces of gold (Eastern plunder) from ^{Succors of} Robert Guiscard. The mercenary Romans ^{money from} the Normans. were again faithful subjects of the Pope; and when Henry, once more under the walls, demanded the fulfilment of the treaty, they evaded their oaths both by the most insolent mockery and pitiful casuistry. They had promised that the Pope should *give the crown*, not that he should crown and anoint the King. They proposed, and the Representative of all Truth sanctioned their proposition, that if penitent, and his penitence implied his resignation of his authority into the hands of the Pope, he should receive the crown, with the Papal benediction. If not, he should still receive the

crown — it was to be let down to him upon a rod from the Castle of St. Angelo. Such was the power and noli-ness of oaths!

Henry renewed the siege with the resolute determination to hear no further terms from his stubborn and treacherous foe. But the city still held out. His garrison had been obliged by sickness to abandon the fort on the Palatiolus and his other works. All was to recommence anew. He made some predatory incursions into Campania, and perhaps, to watch any hostile movements of Robert Guiscard, into Apulia. But Germany imperatively required his presence; his interests there were in peril; and in despair of success against Rome, he was actually about to give orders for his retreat. Suddenly an embassy arrived from the Romans (the gold pieces of Guiscard were now, no doubt, exhausted, and those of Henry more lavishly distributed), offering to surrender the city. Hildebrand hastily retired into the Castle of St. Angelo; and from its walls the haughty Pope might behold the excommunicated King and his rival Pope entering in triumph through the Lateran gate. He saw the procession pass, as it were, under his feet, first to an assembly of prelates to elect the Pope. He had to endure the mockery of a summons to this hostile Council, which affected to wait three days for his appearance;¹ and then again on Palm Sunday he saw them pass to the consecration of Guibert of Ravenna in the Church of St. Peter. Guibert was consecrated by the Bishops of Modena, Bologna, and Arezzo. On Easter Day, the King, with

Henry master
of Rome.
Christmas,
1083.

A.D. 1084.
March 29.

¹ Expectatur per triduum delitescendo. — Benzo, Proleg. ad L. vii.

his wife Bertha, passed in state to the Vatican, to receive the imperial crown from the hands of Clement III. A few feeble attempts by his adherents to excite tumult, and to maintain some strongholds in the city, were suppressed by the troops of Henry. Gregory was a prisoner — a prisoner who, it might seem, must soon be compelled by despair, by famine, or by treachery, to yield himself up to the unslaked vengeance of the King.

Tidings, however, soon arrived which at once changed the aspect of affairs. Desiderius, the Abbot Approach of the Normans April. of Monte Casino, arrived in Rome, and communicated both to the Emperor and to the Pontiff that Robert Guiscard was rapidly advancing at the head of 6,000 knights and 30,000 foot. It was a strange army of the faith: from every quarter men had rushed to his banner, some to rescue the Pope, others from love of war. The Saracens had enlisted in great numbers.

The news was as appalling to Henry as welcome to the Pope. His army was not strong enough to cope with this formidable host. He made the Ro- Early in May. mans swear fidelity to their Cæsar; he took forty hostages; he destroyed part of the fortifications which had resisted his power, the Castle on the Capitoline Hill, and some of the walls of the Leonine city. He then retired towards Civita Castellana.

Three days after he had evacuated the city appeared the Norman army under the walls. The Romans had reason to dread — they cordially hated (their hatred affected the tone of contempt) these barbarous Northmen. The gates were closed, the walls manned for defence. But on the first day the Normans surprised

the gate of St. Lorenzo: the city, which had for three years defied the besieging army of Henry, was Normans take the city. at once in their power.¹ The first act of the dutiful son of the Church was to release the Pope from his imprisonment in the Castle of St. Angelo. He conducted him with the utmost respect to the Lateran Palace. But Gregory must now witness those horrors which, as long as they afflicted Germany or Northern Italy, he had contemplated unmoved, intent on building up his all-ruling Theocracy. From the feet of the Pope, having just received his blessing, the Normans spread through the city, treating it with all the cruelty of a captured town, pillaging, violating, murdering, wherever they met with opposition. The Romans had been surprised, not subdued. For two days and nights Insurrection. they brooded over their vengeance; on the third day they broke out in general insurrection, rushed armed into the streets, and began a terrible carnage of their conquerors. The Normans were feasting in careless security; but with the discipline of practised soldiers they flew to arms; the whole city was one wild conflict. The Norman horse poured into the streets, but the Romans fought at advantage, from their possession of the houses and their knowledge of the ground. They were gaining the superiority; the Normans saw their peril. The remorseless Guiscard gave the word to fire the houses. From every quarter the flames rushed up — houses, palaces, convents, churches, as the night darkened, were seen in awful conflagration. The distracted inhabitants dashed wildly into the streets,

¹ Non per triennium ut Henricus, sed sequente die, quam venit, perfidam civitatem cepit. — Bonizo.

no longer endeavoring to defend themselves, but to save their families. They were hewn down by hundreds. The Saracen allies of the Pope had been the foremost in the pillage, and were now the foremost in the conflagration and the massacre. No house, no monastery, was secure from plunder, murder, rape. Nuns were defiled, matrons forced, the rings cut from their living fingers.¹ Gregory exerted himself, not without success, in saving the principal churches. It is probable, however, that neither Goth nor Vandal, neither Greek nor German, brought such desolation on the city as this capture by the Normans. From this period dates the desertion of the older part of the city, and its gradual extension over the site of the modern city, the Campus Martius.

Guiscard was at length master of the ruins of Rome, but the vengeance of the Pope's deliverer was yet unappeased. Many thousand Romans were sold publicly as slaves — many carried into the remotest parts of Calabria.² We have heard no remonstrance from the Bishop, from the Sovereign of Rome, on this hateful alliance with the enemies of the faith, the Saracens. Of this, perhaps, he was ignorant when in the Castle of

¹ *Itaque gens diversa, de Deo ignara, sceleribus ac homicidiis edocta, adulteriis variisque fornicationibus assuefacta, omnibus criminibus quæ ferro et igne, talibus agi solet negotiis, sese furialiter immererat: quin etiam virgines sacratas corrumpentes, miserorumque Romanorum uxores incestantes, ac annulos earum digitis detruncantes.* — Landulph Sen. iv. 3. The hostile writer lays all to Gregory's charge. Cum Roberto exiliens, Salernum profectus est. Ubi per pauca vivens tempora tanquam malorum pœnam emeritus, interiit.

² Bonizo relates and triumphs in this act of vengeance. Dehinc apud Lateranense palatium per multos dies degens (the Pope, too, was in the Lateran palace) multa millia Romanorum vendidit *ut Judæos*; quosdam vero captivos duxit usque Calabriam; et tali penâ digni erant multari, qui ad similitudinem Judæorum pastorem suorum tradiderant.

St. Angelo. No powerful intercession is now made — no threatened excommunication is now menaced — in behalf of his rebellious, his perfidious, yet subdued subjects — most of the sufferers, no doubt, guiltless and defenceless. The ferocious Guiscard is still recognized as his ally, his deliverer, his protector, perhaps his avenger.

Unprotected by his foreign guard, the Pope could not now trust himself in the city, which would, no doubt, and not without justice, attribute its ruin and misery to his obstinacy. In the company of Robert Guiscard, oppressed with shame and affliction, he retired from the smoking ruins and the desolated streets of the city of St. Peter, first to the monastery of Monte Casino, afterwards to the Norman's strong castle of Salerno. From Salerno, unshaken by the horrors which
Gregory retires from Rome. he had witnessed or the perils he had escaped, Hildebrand thundered out again the unmitigated excommunication against Henry, the Anti-Pope Clement, and all their adherents.¹

To Rome Gregory never returned: death came
His death. slowly upon him at Salerno. He spoke even to the end with undoubting confidence on the goodness of his cause, and his assurance that he was departing to Heaven. He gave a general absolution to mankind; but from this all-embracing act of mercy he excepted his deadly enemies and those of the Church, Henry so called the King, the usurping Pontiff Guibert, and those

¹ At quia Normannorum instabilitas urbe capta, et prædæ data, multa mala perpetraverit, nobilium Romanorum filias stuprando et nocentes pariter innocentesque pari poenâ affligendo, nullumque modum, uti victoribus mos est, in rapinâ, crudelitate, direptione habendo . . . veritusque ne duce recedente infidelitas Romana exagitata recrudesceret, et quos antea habuerit quasi fidos amicos, pateretur infidos, cedendum tempori arbitratus, Salernum se contulit. — Hugon. Chron. ii. ; Pertz, viii. p. 462.

who were their counsellors and abettors in their ungodly cause. His last memorable words have something of proud bitterness: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile." The words might not be intended as an arraignment of Divine Providence, but where was the beauty of resignation? or was it a Pharisaic reproach on the wickedness of mankind, blind and ungrateful to his transcendent virtues? May 25, 1085.

"In exile," said a Churchman of congenial feelings, whose priestly pride was not rebuked by that spectacle of mortality, "in exile thou couldst not die! Vicar of Christ and his Apostles, thou hast received the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession!"¹

Gregory is the Cæsar of spiritual conquest; the great and inflexible assertor of the supremacy of the sacerdotal order. (Character of Gregory.) The universal religious Autocracy, the Caliphate, with the difference that the temporal power was accessory to the spiritual, not the spiritual an hereditary appendage to the temporal supremacy, expanded itself upon the austere yet imaginative mind of Gregory as the perfect Idea of the Christian Church. The theory of Augustine's City of God, no doubt, swam before the mind of the Pontiff, in which a new Rome was to rise and rule the world by religion. Augustine's theory, indeed, was aristocratic rather than monarchical, or rather the monarchical power remained centered in the Invisible Lord — in Christ himself. To the Pope there could be no Rome without a Cæsar, and the Cæsar of the spiritual monarchy was himself: in him was gathered and centred all power, that of the

¹ Bernried, 109, 110.

collective priesthood and episcopacy ; it flowed from him with a kind of Pantheistic emanation, and was reabsorbed in him. But, unhappily, the ideal Pope is as purely imaginary as an ideal King, or an ideal Republic governed by virtue alone. The Pope was to be a man elected by men. If this spiritual monarchy either could confine, or had attempted to confine that universal authority to which it aspired, or that vast authority which it actually obtained over the hopes and fears of men, to purposes purely and exclusively spiritual : if it could have contented itself with enforcing, and by strictly religious means, an uniformity — a wise and liberal uniformity — an uniformity expanding with the expansion of the human intellect, of Christian faith and practice and Christian virtue throughout the whole Christian community : if it had restrained itself, in its warfare, to the extirpation of evil, to the promotion of social and domestic virtue ; if in its supremacy over kings, to the suppression of unchristian vices, tyranny, injustice, inhumanity ; over mankind at large, to moral transgressions and infringements on the rights and persons and property of others : if it had taught invariably by Christian means of persuasion ; if it had always kept the ultimate end of all religion in view, the happiness of mankind through Christian holiness and love : then posterity might wisely regret that this higher than Platonic vision was never realized ; that mankind are receding further than ever from the establishment in this form of the Christian commonwealth of nations. But throughout the contest of many centuries the sacerdotal supremacy was constantly raising the suspicion, too well grounded, that power, not the beneficial use of power, was its final object. It was occasionally popular, even

democratic, in assisting the liberties of man, as in later times, in its alliance with the Italian republics; but it was too manifestly not from the high and disinterested love of freedom, but from jealousy of any other Lord over the liberties of men but itself. In this respect Gregory was the type, the absolute model and example of the spiritual monarch. Posterity demands whether his imperial views, like those of the older Caesar, were not grounded on the total prostration of the real liberty of mankind; even in that of the liberty of the subordinate sacerdotal order. It was a magnificent Idea, but how was it reconcilable with the genuine sublimity of Christianity, that an order of men — that one single man — had thrust himself without authority, to an extent men began early to question, between man and God — had arrayed himself, in fact, in secondary divinity? Against his decrees every insurrection of the human mind was treason; every attempt to limit his power impiety. Even if essentially true, this monarchical autocracy was undeniably taught and maintained, and by none more than by Hildebrand, through means utterly at variance with the essence of Christianity, at the sacrifice of all the higher principles, by bloody and desolating wars, by civil wars with all their horrors, by every kind of human misery. Allow the utmost privilege of the age — of a warlike, a ferocious age, in which human life had no sanctity or security — yet this demand of indulgence for the spirit of the times is surely destructive of the claim to be immutable Christianity: the awful incongruity between the Churchman and the Christian, between the Representative of the Prince of Peace and the Prince of Peace himself, is fatal to the whole.

Yet in a lower view, not as a permanent, eternal, immutable law of Christianity, but as one of the temporary phases, through which Christianity, in its self-accommodation to the moral necessities of men, was to pass, the hierarchical, the Papal power of the Middle Ages, by its conservative fidelity as guardian of the most valuable reliques of antiquity, of her arts, her laws, her language ; by its assertion of the superiority of moral and religious motives over the brute force of man ; by the safe guardianship of the great primitive and fundamental truths of religion, which were ever lurking under the exuberant mythology and ceremonial ; above all by wonderful and stirring examples of the most profound, however ascetic devotion, of mortification and self-sacrifice and self-discipline, partially, at least, for the good of others ; by splendid charities, munificent public works, cultivation of letters, the strong trust infused into the mind of man, that there was some being even on earth whose special duty it was to defend the defenceless, to succor the succorless, to be the refuge of the widow and orphan, to be the guardian of the poor ; all these things, with all the poetry of the Middle Ages, in its various forms of legend, of verse, of building, of music, of art, may justify, or rather command mankind to look back upon these fallen idols with reverence, with admiration, and with gratitude. The hierarchy of the Middle Ages counterbalances its vast ambition, rapacity, cruelty, by the most essential benefits to human civilization. The Papacy itself is not merely an awful, but a wonderful institution. Gregory VII. himself is not contemplated merely with awe, but in some respects, and with great drawbacks, as a benefactor of mankind.

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORY'S SUCCESSORS.

GREGORY VII. had died in exile, overpowered, if unsubdued; a fugitive before the face of his enemies, yet disclaiming to yield one point of his lofty pretensions. But who would take his place and maintain with equal vigor and intrepidity the imperilled Papacy? The last of that race of men who had labored with Hildebrand for the establishment of the Italian, monastic, Hildebrandine Papacy, was Desiderius, the Abbot of Monte Casino: the sharer in his counsels, his supporter in all his difficulties. Gregory had already designated, on one occasion, Desiderius as the future Pope; and when his faithful adherents pressed around him, to endeavor to obtain from his dying lips the nomination of his successor, he had in the first instance named Desiderius; in default of his acceptance of the office (which Gregory seems to have anticipated), he added three Prelates, Otto of Ostia, Hugh of Lyons, and Anselm of Lucca. Even in Salerno Desiderius was urged to accept the Pontificate; but he was advanced in years; he was determined not to abandon the holy quiet of Monte Casino. He retired to his monastery, and was followed by the Cardinals and Bishops of the party, still pressing upon him the onerous

distinction.¹ His obstinate humility resisted their flattering importunities. But he acquiesced in the necessity of taking measures to elect a legitimate Pope, under the protection of the Countess Matilda. The summer heats prevented any approach to Rome. In the autumn, apprehending that they were about to compel him to assume the office, he exacted a promise from the Roman Cardinals and Bishops, from the Norman Princes, from Jordano of Capua, and Count Rainulf, that they would neither themselves use any violence to compel him to be Pope, nor permit others to do so. Thus May 25, 1085. May 24, 1086 passed a year. In the mean time, the Anti-Pope, Clement III., ruled in part of Rome; his progress excited increasing apprehension. At Easter many Cardinals and Prelates ventured to enter Rome from different quarters; they sent to summon Desiderius, and the Bishops and Cardinals who had taken refuge in Monte Casino, with Gysulf, Prince of Salerno. Desiderius, not suspecting any design upon himself, hastened with his Bishops to Rome. On the eve of Pentecost there was a great assemblage of the clergy, and the diaconate of the Church of Saint Lucia; again the Pontificate was pressed on Desiderius by the unanimous voice; again he refused it, and threatened to return to Monte Casino. A private meeting was held between the leaders of the ecclesiastical party and Cencius, the Consul of Rome (a Cencius now on the high Papalist side); it was determined to elect the Bishop of Ostia, with the singular provision that Desiderius should pledge

¹ Waltram de Unit. Eccles. gives a list of the German bishops on each side after Gregory's death, in 1085. Some bishops, Adelbero of Wurtzburg, gave up their sees. Henry filled up all these vacancies: in Metz, however, there was no episcopal function performed for ten years. — P. 315.

himself to receive the new Pope in his impregnable fortress convent of Monte Casino, to assist his cause, and protect him from all his enemies. Desiderius consented at once; and with the abbot's crosier, which he held in his hand, pledged the fealty of his people. Another public assemblage took place, more crowded, more imposing; the suffrages were nearly all united in favor of the Bishop of Ostia; when a Cardinal arose, and urged the objection which had so often before been overruled, that the translation of a Bishop from one see to another was against the Canons. The whole assembly rose, seized the struggling Desiderius, hurried him A.D. 1087. into the Church of Saint Lucia, and proclaimed him Pope, under the name of Victor III. Desiderius, to show his unyielding reluctance, though arrayed in the scarlet cope, refused to put on the alb.

The Imperial Prefect, overawed by the Norman forces, which, under Gysulf, Prince of Salerno, had accompanied Desiderius to Rome, and by the powerful Cencius, had not ventured to disturb these proceedings. But the Prince of Salerno seized the opportunity of demanding the consecration of a creature of his own as the Archbishop of that city: this was sternly refused by Desiderius and his Bishops. The Prefect seized the opportunity of the defection of Gysulf; collected some troops, seized the Capitol, and threatened the safety of the new Pope. Four days after his election Desiderius fled from Rome; he remained three days at Ardea; at Terracina he put off all May 27.

the Papal insignia, returned to Monte Casino the simple Abbot, as if determined to close his days in peace in his humbler sphere: no remonstrances, no representations of the desolate condition of the Church could induce

him to resume his state ; for nearly a whole year the Church remained without an ostensible head ; the Anti-Pope Guibert without a rival. Otto, Bishop of Ostia, had quietly submitted to the loss of the tiara, which had so nearly fallen upon his head, and thus paved the way

for his own speedy election as Urban II.
Hugh of Lyons.

Hugh of Lyons has left a bitter record of his disappointed ambition : he was absent from Rome at the time of the election, but acquiesced in the inauguration of Desiderius. He visited Monte Casino ; and if there be the shadow of truth in the incredible scheme, which, writing to the Countess Matilda, he declares that he heard from the lips of Desiderius, and from other bishops to whose testimony he refers the Countess, Desiderius must have contemplated a total departure from the policy of Pope Gregory. He openly asserted that he had consented to crown King Henry ; more incredible still, he averred that the invasion of the patrimony of St. Peter by Henry was with his cognizance and assent. Pope Victor III. was guilty of other acts of treason against the memory of Gregory : he declared one Bishop elect, though absolved by Gregory, still under excommunication ; Atto of March 21. Milan, though he had died impenitent, unab- solved from his excommunication, to be among the blessed ; and that himself should desire no higher place in glory than that of Atto.¹ His ordinary conversation was a continued reproof of the acts of Gregory ; he had even proposed the election of a German Pope, Herman of Metz. These are either calumnies, utterly ground- less and sheerly mendacious, or exaggerations of some peaceful counsels which Desiderius, weary of strife, and

¹ The two letters of Hugh of Lyons to Matilda in Labbe, Concil.—P. 414.

under the fond hope of restoring peace to the Church, may have ventured to suggest in his holy solitude. Mid-Lent,
1087.

Early in the spring, not two weeks after his retirement, assembled at Capua many Bishops and Cardinals; among the latter, Otto of Ostia and Hugh of Lyons, Cencius the Consul of Rome, Jordano Prince of Capua, and Roger Duke of Apulia, with other Norman princes, as Hugh of Lyons no doubt hoped, to elect a new Pope. But the partisans of Desiderius, at his own secret suggestions (according to the malicious statement of Hugh of Lyons), or rather the whole assembly, urged Desiderius, even with prayers and tears, to resume his Pontificate. Desiderius
resumes the
Pontificate. After two days' resistance, he yielded at length; and notwithstanding the remonstrances of Otto and the stricter Cardinals, submitted to pay what seemed the price of hearty support from the Norman Princes; he submitted to the consecration of Alfano, who was accused of aspiring to the see by unlawful means, as Archbishop of Salerno. He returned on Palm Sunday to Monte Casino, where he celebrated Easter. He then advanced, under the escort of the Princes of Capua and Salerno, crossed the Tiber near the city of Ostia, which perhaps its Bishop maintained in his allegiance; and pitched his tents before the Church of St. Peter, now occupied or rather garrisoned by the Anti-Pope Guibert. A sudden attack of the Norman soldiery made him master of the Church. On the Sunday after Ascension, in the presence of multitudes of the Normans, chiefly from the Transteverine region, where his party predominated, he was consecrated by the Roman Bishops of Ostia, Porto, Tusculum, and Alba, with many other Cardinals and

Prelates. But he ventured on no long stay in the insecure capital; after eight days he retired to Bari, and thence to Monte Casino.

Shortly afterwards the Countess Matilda entered Rome; she sent earnest messages to the Pope; Countess Matilda. it was chiefly to see and to enjoy the converse of the Holy Pontiff that she had gone to Rome. Victor, though laboring under the infirmities of age and sickness, embarked on the coast, and landed at Ostia. He was received with the utmost respect by the Countess Matilda. His partisans were still in possession of St. Peter's; on St. Barnabas' Day he celebrated mass on the high altar. The day closed with a sudden irruption of the forces of Matilda and the Pope into the city itself, which was chiefly in the possession of the Anti-Pope. Victor was master of the whole Transteverine region, of St. Peter's, of the Castle of St. Angelo, and considerable part of Rome, with the cities of Ostia and Porto. But on St. Peter's Eve an Imperial messenger arrived; he summoned the Senators, the Consuls, and the people of Rome, on their allegiance to the crown, to abandon the cause of Victor. The versatile people rose on his side, drove out the troops of Matilda, who still from the heights above maintained possession of the Church of St. Peter. This became the centre of the bloody strife; men warred with the utmost fury as to who should celebrate the Apostle's holyday in his great church.¹ Neither party obtained this triumph; the altar remained the whole day without light, incense, or

¹ According to the *Chronicon Augustense* Guibert was absent from Rome when it was thus surprised by his rival Victor. That chronicle gives the darker and Imperialist character of Desiderius and his proceedings. He is accused of buying the Norman aid, and by that purchased aid alone obtained a triumph for the monkish party. — *Apud Freher.*, vol. i.

sacrifice ; for the discomfited troops of the Pope were forced to take refuge in the Castle of St. Angelo ; those of the Anti-Pope did not yet venture to take possession of the Church. Guibert celebrated high mass in the neighboring Church of Santa Maria, with the two towers or belfries, from both of which he had just smoked or burned out the garrison. The next day the partisans of Guibert took possession of St. Peter's, washed the altar clean from the pollution of the hostile mass, and then celebrated the holy Eucharist. But their triumph, too, was short ; the following day they were again driven out ; and Pope Victor ruled in St. Peter's.

Yet Victor dared not remain in Rome ; he retired again to his Monte Casino.¹ In August a council was held at Benevento. Pope Victor III. presided in the assembly, and renewed in the strongest terms the excommunication of Guibert the Anti-Pope, who, by the aid of the Imperial arms, not fearing the judgment of the great Eternal Emperor, had filled Rome with every kind of violence, crime, and bloodshed, invaded the pontifical throne, and driven forth the rightful Pope. To this excommunication was subjoined another against Hugh of Lyons and the Abbot of Marseilles. The abbot had been party to the election of Pope Victor. The archbishop had offered his allegiance, implored and received from him the legation to France. Yet their

¹ The Monks of Monte Casino boasted of a wonder which took place at the shrine of St. Benedict. Among the pilgrims who approached the altar was one in ecclesiastical attire. He was asked who he was ; he replied, " St. Peter. I am come to celebrate the day of my martyrdom at the altar of my brother Benedict ; since I cannot stay at Rome, where my church is desecrated by strife and war." The monks of Monte Casino celebrated from thenceforth St. Peter's day with the same solemnity as that of St. Benedict, a comparison which provokes the indignant remonstrance of Cardinal Baronius.

ambition, disappointed of the Papacy, had driven them into open schism; they had cut themselves off from the Roman Church, and therefore, as self-condemned heretics, were excluded from that communion. The condemnation was renewed of all who should receive the investiture to any ecclesiastical benefice whatever from the hands of the laity. But even before the close of the council Victor was seized with a mortal malady. He had hardly time to retire to Monte Casino, to order the affairs of his monastery, to commend Oderisi as his successor to the abbacy of Monte Casino, the Bishop of Ostia to the throne of the Pontificate. He died in three days.

Death of
Victor III.

A.D. 1087.
Sept. 16.

In those times of blind and obstinate mutual hostility no rapid death, common enough, especially in that climate, could take place without suggesting a providential judgment, or something out of the course of nature. In Germany it was rumored and believed that the Pope, while celebrating mass, in ratification of the excommunicating decrees of the council, was seized with his mortal pains,¹ and that his foetid body was hardly removed from the church. Later writers, with no ground whatever, imputed his death to poison administered in the sacred chalice.²

¹ *Chronicon Augustense sub ann.*

² *Dandulus in Chronic. T. xii. Rev. Ital. Martinus Polonus.*

CHAPTER V.

URBAN II.

THE Pontificate of Urban II. is one of the great epochs in the history of the Papacy and of Latin Christianity. The first Crusade united Christendom in one vast warlike confederacy ; and at the head of that confederacy the Pope, by common consent, took his proper place. The armies were the armies of the faith, and therefore the armies of him who represented the chief apostle of the faith. From the Pope they derived, what they believed their divine commission ; they were his martial missionaries to recover, not for any one Christian prince, but for Christianity itself, that territory to which it asserted an indefeasible title. The land in which the Saviour of mankind was born and died, could not but be the domain, the seignorial possession of the Christian Church.

But the Crusade belongs to the later period of Urban's Pontificate.

On the death of Victor III. the scattered and disorganized monastic or Hildebrandine party were struck almost with despair : yet messengers were sent on all sides to rally their ecclesiastical forces. It was not till above five months had elapsed, that a Council summoned by a number of bishops assembled at Monte Casino, and by the counsel of Oderisi,

A.D. 1088.
March 12.

the Abbot, the successor of Desiderius, met at Terracina; for Rome was in the power of the enemy. The number of archbishops, bishops, and abbots was forty. The Bishop of Porto, with the Bishop of Tusculum, represented the Roman clergy; the Prefect Benedict appeared, and boasted that he bore the unanimous suffrage of the Roman people. There were ambassadors from some Ultramontane prelates, and
March 13,
1088. from the Countess Matilda. After a solemn fast of three days the Bishop of Ostia was elected by acclamation, arrayed in the pontifical robes, and placed on the pontifical throne.

Otto, Bishop of Ostia, was by birth a Frenchman, of Rheims or of some town in the neighborhood. He had been brought up under the severe monastic discipline of Clugny; to embrace this rule he had surrendered the dignity of a canon at Rheims. His instructor had been the famous Bruno, the founder of the Carthusian Order. There was no more bold or sincere asserter of ecclesiastical power; his hostility towards the Emperor had been embittered by his imprisonment and hard usage during the time that he was in the power of Henry. Urban lost no time in proclaiming himself as the elected Pope to the sovereigns of Christian Europe.¹

Some sudden and unexplained revolution enabled Urban to hold a council at Rome in the year after his election. It is probable that the reconciliation, through his intervention, between the sons of Robert Guiscard, Roger and Bohemond, may have placed some Norman forces at his command. One hundred and fifteen bishops ventured to assemble around the Pope.²

¹ Urbani Epist. apud Martene et Durand. A. C. i. 520.

² Among Urban's first acts was the elevation of the Archbishop of Toledo,

The excommunication against the Simonians and the Anti-Pope was renewed in unmitigated rigor : on the Emperor he seems to have preserved a cautious silence. Guibert, shut up by the Romans in one of the strong fortresses of the city, began to enter into negotiations for his peaceful departure. But neither did Urban venture to take up his residence in Rome. He retired to the faithful south : at Amalfi he summoned another council, the decrees of which were marked by the sternly monastic character of the Hildebrandine school.¹

Urban had all the resolute firmness of Gregory, but firmness less aggressive, and tempered with the wisdom of the serpent. His subtler policy was more dangerous, and eventually more fatal, to the Imperial cause, than the more bold and violent oppugnancy of Hildebrand. The times needed consummate prudence. Even in the south the Normans were but uncertain allies, and protectors who rarely failed to exact some grant or privilege in return for their protection. Rome was on that party which at the time could awe her with the greatest power or win her by the most lavish wealth. The Countess Matilda still faithfully maintained the Papal interests in the north of Italy ; she still firmly rejected the claims of the Anti-Pope ; and had taken great part in the election, first of Victor III., now of Urban II. But Anselm of Lucca, who had ruled her mind with his religious authority, was now dead ; the firmness, even the fidelity of Matilda might yield to the overpow-

now won from the Saracens, to the Primacy of Spain. — Florez, *España Sagrada*, vi. 347.

¹ Bernold. Chron. A.D. 1089 (see Stenzel). Jaffé, in the *Regesta*, assembles the 115 bishops at Amalfi.

ering strength of the Imperial party. A terrible event showed the ferocity with which the hatred of the conflicting factions raged in those cities. Bonizo, the expelled Bishop of Sutri (who had written with great vehemence in defence of Hildebrand), was received in Parma as Bishop by the Papal party; the Imperial faction seized him, threw him into prison, plucked out his eyes, and put him to a horrible death by mutilation.

Though in this model of female perfection the clergy, especially the monastic clergy, might, in ordinary times, have expected and admired the great crowning virtue of the sex, virginity, yet it was for the Pope, with his approbation if not in obedience to his commands, that she yielded to what at first at least seemed feminine weakness. She consented, at the age of forty-three, to marry a youth of eighteen. Even this sacrifice was to be made for the welfare of the Church.¹ Matilda wedded Guelf the younger, the son of the powerful Duke of Bavaria, from the family most equal to cope with the Imperial power. This alliance not merely might give manly strength to her counsels, and a warlike leader to her arms in Italy, but it secured her an alliance in Germany itself, dangerous and menacing to King Henry. The marriage was at first kept secret from the Emperor. No sooner was it announced than Henry found it necessary to march into Italy to crush this powerful confederacy. He laid siege to Mantua; after eleven months' resistance he became master of the town by treachery. For two years

Marriage of
Countess
Matilda.

¹ A.D. 1089. Tam *pro incontinentiâ*, quam *pro Romani pontificis obedientiâ*, videlicet ut tanto virilius sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ contra schismaticos posset subvenire. — Berthold. Const. in Chronic. Thus the marriage appeared at first sight to the monastic writers: the close of this connexion perhaps showed the injustice of their fears.

the war continued, so greatly to the advantage of the Emperor that the vassals of Matilda began to remonstrate against her obstinate hostility. She was Sept. 1092. compelled to open negotiations for peace at Carpineto, not far from Canosa. The recognition of the Anti-Pope was the stern and inexorable demand of Henry. The pious Matilda assembled the bishops, the abbots, and the holy hermits, many of whom had taken refuge in her strong fortress from the wild soldiery. She declared herself ready to make peace on just terms. The Bishop of Reggio and the other prelates advised submission, and the abandonment of Urban and his hopeless cause.¹ But a hermit named John sprang up, and declared with all the fire of an inspired prophet, that peace with Henry on such terms would be sin October. against the Holy Ghost. The treaty was broken off; the war raged again, but Henry miscarried in an attack on the strong castle of Montorio; his besieging engines were burned; one of his natural sons slain in the trenches. He made an attempt to surprise Canosa; the scene of his humiliation he hoped to make the scene of his revenge. The troops of Matilda not only succeeded in relieving Canosa, but, covered by a thick fog fell on the rear of Henry's army: the Imperial banner was trailed in the dust, taken, and hung up as a trophy by the victorious Matilda in the church of St. Apollonia at Canosa.

But Urban and Matilda found more useful allies in the bosom of the king's own family. The terrible and revolting tragedy in his own household combined with the unfavorable circumstances in Germany and in Northern Italy to subdue the haughty spirit of Henry. In

¹ See authorities in Stenzel, p. 547.

Germany the elder Guelf, the Duke of Bavaria, thwarted all his measures. Swabia refused allegiance to Frederick of Hohenstauffen, and chose for her prince Berthold, the brother of Gebhard Bishop of Constance, one of Henry's implacable enemies. At a diet in Ulm the States, rejecting Arnold, the bishop named by the Emperor and the Anti-Pope, submitted to Gebhard of Constance as the legate of Pope Urban. They proclaimed a Truce of God until Easter, 1096, for the protection of the estates of the bishops, churches, and monasteries, and of the merchants. The cities eagerly embraced the boon; it was accepted through almost the whole of Southern Germany from the borders of Hungary to Alsace. These were difficult and embarrassing measures; but it was the revolt of his beloved son Conrad which crushed Henry to the earth.

Prince
Conrad. Conrad was a youth of great beauty, gentle disposition, with profound religious impressions, a weak and dreamy character. His sensitive piety surrendered him to the influence of the more austere clergy, who found means of access to his inmost heart. He was shocked with the horrors, with the sacrilegious evils of war, the desecration of churches, the ruin of monasteries. If such were his feelings, his acts were those of unmeasured and unscrupulous ambition. His piety was soon taught to spurn the vulgar virtues of love and obedience to his father. Henry, perhaps on a somewhat questionable title, had endeavored to obtain for him the rich inheritance of his grandmother, Adelheid of Susa. With this view he had carried him to Italy, and left him there to prosecute his claim, but exposed to those fatal influences of the Papal clergy. His father's enemies held out a nobler prize—the

immediate possession of the kingdom of Italy. For neither did the devout Matilda nor the austere Pope decline this unnatural alliance, though it may be doubtful how far they secretly prompted and encouraged at first this breach of the laws of nature.¹ But it is curious to observe how constantly that proverbial hostility of the heirs of kings to their fathers was sanctioned by those who were bound by their station to assert the loftiest Christian morality and the strictest adherence to the commandments of God. So completely was the churchman's interest to absorb all others, that crimes thus against nature, not only were excused by the ordinary passions of men, but by those of the highest pretensions to Christian holiness. What Pope ever, if it promised advantage, refused the alliance of a rebellious son.

The cause which Conrad assigned, or which was assigned by Conrad's new friends, for his revolt, was too monstrous to obtain credit except with those whose minds were prepared to receive it by long and bitter hatred: it is altogether irreconcilable with the conduct of Henry. It was no plea of deep religious scruple at the disobedience of his father to the Church, or his sacrilegious destruction of holy things and holy places. It was an accusation against his father connected with that foul story of the Empress, which ere long obtained such appalling publicity at the council of Piacenza. On Conrad's refusal to commit incest with his mother-in-law, it is even said with the sanction of Henry (the revolting history must be given in plain words), the Emperor had threatened to stigmatize and disinherit

¹ The honest Muratori observes, "Un grande incanto a i figliuoli d' Adamo è la vista d' una corona." — *Ann. d' Italia*

him as a bastard, on no other evidence than the want of likeness to himself, and so to insult the memory of his mother Bertha, which nevertheless Henry cherished with tender reverence to the close of his life; and even at that time the father was striving by violence to put him in possession of the territory of Susa; and the effect, almost the fatal effect, of his conduct on the king his father, can only be ascribed to profound affection, deeply, cruelly, wantonly wounded. It is true that on the discovery of his treasonable intrigues Henry had placed his son under arrest; but Conrad found means to escape, and was received with open arms by the triumphant Matilda. His new allies kept their faith with the revolted son, under whose banner they might now contend with renewed hope, and whom it was their interest to commit irreparably with his father. Conrad was crowned King of Italy, first at Monza, afterwards at Milan, in the Ambrosian Church. Anselm, the archbishop, hitherto on the Imperial side, embraced the stronger party: Milan, Cremona, Lodi, and Piacenza fell off at once from the cause of Henry, and signed a treaty of mutual defence for twenty years against the Empire.¹

The revolt of Conrad seemed to crush the Emperor to the earth.² He had borne all the vicissitudes of his earlier life with unbroken courage; he had risen from his humiliation at Canosa with refreshed energy; he now abandoned himself to despair, threw off the robes and insignia of royalty, and was hardly prevented by his friends from falling on his own sword.

¹ Anselm died Dec. 4, 1093.

² Even the monkish historian, as Stenzel observes, almost feels compassion, nimio dolore afflictus.—Bernold.

As the affairs of the Empire became more dark, the Pope emerged from his place of refuge in the convent fortress of Monte Casino, or in some one of the Norman cities under Norman protection.¹ The temporary success of Henry had emboldened the Roman party of Guibert. He had returned to Rome. March 26,
1094. But Urban ventured to approach and to celebrate Christmas, 1093, in that city. He took up his abode in the palace of one of the Frangipanis. The Anti-Pope held the Vatican, the castle of St. Angelo, and the Lateran; the rest of the city rendered its allegiance to Urban. Early in the following year (Guibert had then fled to Henry, and had even expressed his readiness, if peace could be restored on no other terms, to lay down his papal dignity), fifteen days before Easter, Ferruccio who occupied the Lateran for the Anti-Pope Guibert, offered to surrender his charge for a large sum of money. But Urban, whose only resources had been the devotional offerings of the churches and convents in Southern Italy, and of those who came from more distant regions to acknowledge his supremacy or to bring their affairs before his tribunal, was too poor to pay the price. Fortunately Godfrey, the wealthy Abbot of Vendôme on the Loire, was at Rome; he had brought with him considerable treasures; besides these he sold his mules and horses, and laid the whole sum at the feet of the Pope. The Christmas of the same year (1094) Urban kept in Tuscany. On the 1st of March he advanced, and at the Council of Piacenza struck the last mortal blow at the fame and popularity of Henry, at the Anti- Council of
Piacenza,
March 1-7,
1095.

¹ Urban is at different times at Bari, Brundisium, Capua, Benevento, Troja, Salerno, Anagni, and other less known places. See Jaffé, *Regesta*.

Pope, and the party of the married clergy. It was not, however, the expectation of this triumph of the Pope over the empire, or even the exhibition of the Empress as the accuser of her husband, but rather the universal pre-occupation with the proposed appeal to Christendom on behalf of their Eastern brethren, the proclamation of a Crusade for the conquest of the Holy Land, which swelled the enormous multitudes assembled at the Council of Piacenza. Bishops and abbots crowded from Italy, France, Bavaria, Burgundy, and most parts of Germany. There were 3,000 of the clergy, 30,000 of the laity; no church or public building could contain the vast host. They met in the great plain outside of the city: the ambassadors of the Emperor of the East were present to implore the aid of Christendom against the Unbelievers, who were before the gates of Constantinople.

The Pope would have been more than man not to have seized this opportunity of obtaining the sanction of this vast Christian assembly to his condemnation of his enemies — of compelling them to witness the humiliation of the Emperor. Before this assembly appeared Adelaide, or Praxedes (as she is also named), the daughter of a King, the widow of a powerful Prince of Germany, the wife of the Emperor, to accuse her husband of enormities better, it might have seemed, concealed in the sanctuary of the confessional than proclaimed aloud in all their loathsome detail, to infect the ears of Christendom.¹

March 7,
1095.

Charges
made by the
Empress.

¹ Donizo relates, to the praise of Matilda, her share in this transaction. He has misplaced the revolt of the son, which he relates after the flight of the empress. That revolt he compares to the just judgment of God on the Egyptians by the loss of their first born.

Illius tractat patrem (Matilda) sic Hester ut Aman.

Abstulit uxorem sibi primitus, ut modo prolem.

Vit. Mathild. ii. xi.

These charges had already been rehearsed in a Council at Constance, before the Bishop Gebhard, the implacable enemy of Henry. The Empress had been left in prison at Verona; a party of Matilda's soldiers surprised the guards, and rescued the captive April, 1094. Princess. It is almost incredible, that even in a coarse age, with that deadness to delicacy which belongs to monastic life, and to the now almost universal practice of confession, that the clergy should instigate, an ecclesiastical assembly listen without repugnance to the public depositions, or at least to the attestation of depositions publicly read by a wife against her husband, so loathsome, so unnatural. The Empress accused her husband of abandoning her, or rather of compelling her to submit to promiscuous violation by his court and camp; of urging her to incest with her own son. After times are left to some one of these wretched alternatives—to believe in dissoluteness almost bestial, without any motive but absolute depravity, and with some of the circumstances which form an integral part of the story absolutely contradictory; or in an almost inconceivable depth of malignity in Henry's enemies—malignity too much, indeed, betrayed during the proceedings of the Council; or in the most wicked and shameless unprompted falsehood in the Empress, shameless enough, even if all were true; or (we fear it is but a subterfuge to find a merciful construction) some insanity on her part, which the simple believed, the crafty made use of for their own purposes.

But without waiting any reply or defence from the Emperor, the Pope and the Assembly admitted the whole charges as undeniable, unexaggerated truth. With an ostentatious leniency the Empress was excused

from all penitential discipline, as having been the unassenting victim of the crimes with which she charged herself. She retired to spend the rest of her days in a monastery. The reception of these charges was almost the total ruin of the Imperial party in Lombardy, which was all but abandoned by Henry himself. Some of his most faithful partisans went over to his son and to the Countess Matilda.

The Council of Piacenza, in all its other decrees, obeyed the dictation of Pope Urban. Canons were passed against the Simoniacs and the married clergy. The Faithful were forbidden to be present at any sacred functions performed by the clergy who had not parted with their wives, branded by the name of concubines. The usual anathemas were uttered with lighted candles against the usurper Guibert, and all who abetted his usurpation. Orders conferred by him, or by Bishops excommunicated by the Pope, were declared null; the opinion of Berengar on the Sacrament was pronounced a heresy.¹

Urban, triumphant in Italy, went on to France, to consummate his more perfect victory over the mind of Christendom in the Council of Clermont. He was met at Cremona by Conrad, King of Italy, who paid him the most humble and obsequious homage.² The Pope promised to maintain him as King of Italy, but exacted his cession of the right of investiture. To complete the alienation of Conrad from his father, and to attach him more closely to the Papal party, a marriage was arranged between him and the

April 10.
Urban in
France.

¹ Bernoldi Chronicon. 1095.

² Rex Conrhadus II. obviam procedens stratoris officio usus est. — Cod Mus. Brit. apud Pertz, viii. 474

youthful daughter of the Norman Roger Count of Sicily. She brought him a rich dowry.

Pope Urban had hardly crossed the Alps, when an unexpected revolution in Italy awoke the Emperor again from his prostration and despair. Imperial interests revive in Italy.

Marriages contracted under the auspices and at the instigation of the Pope himself seemed not to secure conjugal happiness. No sooner had the party of Matilda gained this uncontested superiority, than a sudden separation took place between the Countess and her youthful husband.¹ Guelf declared that he had never asserted a husband's privilege; he had respected either her age or her religious scruples. Matilda, whether from some lingering womanly vanity, or from humility which shrunk from that fame she would have acquired from her connubial continency, had kept the secret which her husband disclosed in his indiscreet anger. But there were other reasons for this mutual estrangement. So long as she needed his valor and military aid to protect her dominions she had treated him with respect and affection; on her triumph she needed him no longer, and began to show coldness and indifference. The young and ambitious Bavarian might bear with patience the loss of some of his conjugal rights, but there were others, no doubt his chief temptations, which were refused, to his infinite disappointment. The vast possessions to which, by his marriage, he had supposed himself the undoubted successor, had already been made over by a solemn donation to the Church. The Duke of Bavaria, the father of the younger Guelf, made a hasty journey into Italy and endeavored in vain to work up a

¹ Donizo, the panegyrist of Matilda, maintains a prudent silence as to this marriage: he does not even name Guelf.

reconciliation. In his indignation at his ill-success, he threw himself again into the party of the Emperor, and appealed to Henry to compel the Countess to alter the disposition of her dominions in favor of his son. Henry arose from his retreat in the territory of Padua; he summoned his faithful Veronese, and laid siege to Matilda's strong town Nogarà. Matilda rallied her forces to the rescue, and Henry had not strength to maintain the siege. The Guelfs retired to Germany; followed not long after by Henry himself. Matilda, strong in the alliance of Conrad, now connected by marriage with the Norman Roger, and the Papal party, with the King of Italy in the North, the Normans in the South, bade defiance to the enfeebled and disorganized Imperialists, and hoped finally to crush the obstinate Anti-Pope. Yet it was not till two years after that a party of Crusaders, on their way through Rome, reduced the whole city, except the Castle of St. Angelo, to obedience to the Pope. Guibert was at length dispossessed even of the Castle of St. Angelo.¹

Pope Urban, in the mean time, had passed on to accomplish, in a more congenial land, his great purpose, the proclamation of the Crusade. He knew that Italy was not the land which would awaken to a burst of religious enthusiasm at the summons of a Pope; one, too, with a contested title. The maritime cities, Pisa, Genoa, Venice might be roused, as they had been by Victor III., to piratical expeditions against the Mohammedans of Africa, where their pious zeal might be rewarded by rich plunder. But the clergy were too much engrossed and distracted by their own factions, the laity too much divided between the Papal and the

¹ He held it in 1097.

Imperial interests, with the exception of the Normans were by no means so rudely enamored of war as to embark, on an impulse of generous or pious feeling, in a dangerous and unpromising cause. At Piacenza the cold appeal met with a cold reception; the Council came to no determination; even the Pope, occupied with his own more immediate objects, the degradation of the Emperor, the subjugation of the Anti-Pope and the hostile clergy, displayed none of that fiery energy, that kindling eloquence, which he reserved for a more auspicious occasion.

Urban entered France; he celebrated the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin at Puy, in the Velay; he visited many other cities — Tarrascon,¹ Avignon,² Mâcon on the Saone;³ retired to his beloved Oct. 18, 1095. monastery of Clugny, to await the Council summoned for the 18th of November, at Clermont, in Auvergne. There he remained occupied in confirming and enlarging the privileges conferred by his predecessor on this great centre of the monastic religious movement of the age, and in consecrating the high altar of the church. On his entrance into France he was met by a happy omen and manifestation of his increasing power — the acknowledgment of his title to the Papacy by England. This had been accomplished by Anselm the Norman, the learned Primate of the island.

Urban entered his native France, not deigning to consider that it was the realm of a king whom, if of more daring character, he might have tempted to hostility. But over Philip of France the sentence of excommunication was but suspended; and he cowered before the condemnation of the Pope.

¹ Sept. 11.² Sept. 12.³ Oct. 17.

Philip I., a sovereign of weak character, and not less weak in authority over his almost coequal nobles, having grown weary of his wife Bertha, the daughter of the Count of Holland, had endeavored to divorce her on some frivolous plea of consanguinity not admitted by the clergy. His seduction of Beltrada, the wife of a powerful noble, was an offence against the feudal honor of his great vassals and the duty of a sovereign, as well as against the Church and the religion of Christ. The clergy of France refused to solemnize the unlawful and adulterous marriage. A Norman or a French Bishop¹ had been tempted by gratitude for actual favors, and by the hope of future advantage, to desecrate the holy ceremony. Hugh of Lyons, the rival of Urban for the Pontificate, had been restored to favor, and reinvested in the legatine authority in France. He summoned a National Council at Autun, which ventured to anticipate that sentence which could not but be approved and ratified by the Pope. Philip had implored delay, his ambassadors had appeared at Piacenza, and the Pope had consented for a time to suspend the sentence; an act not perhaps uninfluenced by his desire of humiliating Hugh of Lyons, who had eluded or disregarded the Pope's summons to the Council at Piacenza. But the case was too glaring to escape the censure; the monarch too impotent to demand further delay. In the preliminary business of the Council of Clermont, despatched with haste, hardly noticed, passed the excommunication of the greatest sovereign of Christendom, at least in rank, except the Emperor, the ruler of the country in which the Council

Philip I. of
France.

Excommu-
nicated.

¹ Some authorities assert Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, others the Bishop of Senlis.

sate.¹ So completely were men's minds absorbed by the expectation of that great Event for which they had been so long in preparation, and concerning which they were now wrought to the utmost height of eagerness, the Crusade for the conquest of the Holy Land.

¹ Philip cowered under the ecclesiastical censure. He gave up his royal state. *Nunquam diademata portavit, nec purpuram induit, neque solennitatem aliquam regio more celebravit.* — Orderic. Vit. lib. 8.

END OF VOL. III.



HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY;

INCLUDING THAT OF

THE POPES

TO THE PONTIFICATE OF NICHOLAS V.



VOLUME IV.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FOURTH VOLUME.

BOOK VII. (*continued.*)

CHAPTER VI.

THE CRUSADES.

A.D		PAGE
	Sanctity of the Holy Land.....	15
	Pilgrimages.....	17
	Relics — Commerce.....	19
	Scheme of Gregory VII.....	24
	Peter the Hermit.....	25
1094	Council of Clermont.....	28
1094	Results of Crusades.....	32
	1. Estrangement of the East.....	38
	2. Power of the Pope.....	41
	Wealth of clergy.....	46
	3. Religious wars against Jews — Heretics — Un- believers.....	49
	4. Chivalry.....	54

BOOK VIII.

CHAPTER I.

END OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV.

1099	Paschal II.....	67
	The Emperor resumes his power.....	70
	Peace of the Empire.....	73

A.D.		PAGE
1103	The Pope excommunicates Henry.....	75
	Unpopularity of the peace.....	77
1104	Revolt of Prince Henry.....	79
1105	Henry IV. a prisoner.....	83
1106	Death of Henry.....	86

CHAPTER II.

HENRY V. AND POPE PASCHAL II.

	Synod of Guastalla.....	90
1110	Diet at Ratisbon.....	93
	Henry V. in Italy — Advances on Rome.....	94
1111	Treaty.....	98
	Henry V. Emperor.....	100
	Pope refuses the coronation.....	104
	Insurrection in Rome.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Coronation of the Emperor.....	108
1112	Council in the Lateran.....	111
	Council of Vienne excommunicates the Emperor..	112
	Discontents in the Empire.....	114
1115	Death of Countess Matilda.....	116
	Archbishopric of Milan.....	117
1116	Council in the Lateran.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Henry V. in Italy.....	122
	Advances to Rome — in Rome.....	123
1118	Death of Pope Paschal.....	124
	Gelasius II. — seized by Frangipani.....	125
	Flies to Gaeta — Burdinus Antipope (Gregory VIII.).....	127
	Gelasius II. in Rome — in France — Death.....	128

CHAPTER III.

CALIXTUS II.

1119	Calixtus II.....	130
	Council at Rheims.....	133
	Negotiations with the Emperor.....	135

A.D		PAGE
	Excommunication of the Emperor.....	138
	Calixtus in Italy — The Antipope.....	139
1122	Concordat of Worms.....	144
1123	Lateran Council.....	146

CHAPTER IV.

ST. BERNARD — INNOCENT II.

1124	Death of Calixtus.....	149
1125	of Henry V.....	<i>ib.</i>
1124	Honorius II.....	151
1130	Contested election — Innocent II. — Anacletus II..	152
	Bernard of Clairvaux.....	155
	Molesme	160
	Stephen Harding — Cîteaux.....	161
	Early life of St. Bernard.....	163
	Innocent II. in France.....	167
	Acknowledged by France — England — the Empire	171
1132	The Emperor Lothair the Saxon in Italy.....	172
1139	Lateran Council.....	175
	Innocent II. prisoner of the Normans.....	178

CHAPTER V.

INTELLECTUAL MOVEMENT.

	Intellectual movement.....	179
	Gotschalk	182
	John Scotus Erigena.....	184
	Roscelin.....	190
	Anselm	191
	Abélard.....	196
	William of Champeaux.....	198
	Heloisa	200
1121	Council of Soissons.....	205
1122-5	The Paraclete.....	207
1126	St. Gildas.....	209
1140	St. Bernard — Council of Sens.....	213

A.D.		PAGE
	Condemnation of Abélard at Rome.....	218
1142	Death — Philosophy.....	220

CHAPTER VI.

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

	Arnold of Brescia — Doctrines.....	226
1132	In Brescia.....	229
1139	Condemned by Council of Lateran.....	236
	In Zurich — in Rome.....	<i>ib.</i>
1143	Death of Innocent II. — Cœlestine II.....	241
1144	Lucius II.....	242
	Death of Lucius.....	243
1146	Eugenius III. — Arnold in Rome.....	244
1146	Eugenius flies to France.....	247
	Bernard and William of York.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Gilbert de la Porée.....	248
	Bernard's Crusade.....	250
	The Jews — Disasters of the Crusades.....	253
	Suger, Abbot of St. Denys.....	257

CHAPTER VII.

HADRIAN IV. — FREDERICK BARBAROSSA.

	Hadrian IV. — Frederick Barbarossa.....	261
1152-3	Eugenius in Rome — Death.....	<i>ib.</i>
1153-4	Anastasius IV. — Hadrian IV.....	263
1155	Fall of Roman republic.....	265
	Frederick Barbarossa in Italy.....	266
	Death of Arnold of Brescia.....	269
	Romans and Barbarossa.....	271
	Frederick and Pope Hadrian — Coronation.....	272
1156	Frederick retires to Germany.....	274
	Alliance of the Pope with Sicily.....	<i>ib.</i>
1157	Diet at Besançon — Strife of the Emperor and the Pope	275
1158	Frederick in Italy.....	278
1159	Death of Hadrian.....	286

CHAPTER VIII.

ALEXANDER III. — VICTOR IV. — THOMAS À BECKET.

A.D.		PAGE
	Contested Election — Alexander III. — Victor IV.	287
1160	Schism	291
	Alexander III. in France	294
1164	Death of Victor — Paschal III.	296
	Thomas à Becket	<i>ib.</i>
	England — Decay of Saxon clergy	298
	Norman hierarchy — Lanfranc	299
	Anselm	303
	Bishops under Stephen	305
	Becket's birth and youth	311
1155-9	Becket Chancellor	316
1162	Becket Archbishop of Canterbury	323
	Gilbert Foliot	<i>ib.</i>
1163	Becket at Tours	327
	Beginning of strife	328
	Immunities of the clergy	330
	Character of Henry II.	332
	Parliament	334
1164	Council of Clarendon — Constitutions	336
	Parliament of Northampton	343
	Flight of Becket	352
	King Louis of France	355
	Henry's Ambassadors at Sens	357
	Becket at Sens	358
	Becket at Pontigny	361
1165	Negotiations with the Emperor — Diet at Wurtz- burg	362
	Becket at Vezelay	368
1166	John of Oxford at Rome	373
1167	William of Pavia — Cardinal Otho — Legates ...	377
	Flight of Frederick from Italy	<i>ib.</i>
1168	Meeting at Gisors	379
1169	Meeting at Montmirail	384
	War of France and England	386
	Excommunication of the Bishops by Becket	387

A.D.		PAGE
	Gratian and Vivian Legates.....	389
	Meeting at Montmartre.....	395
	King's Proclamation.....	397
	Commission to Archbishop of Rouen and Bishop of Nevers.....	398
	Bishops absolved.....	399
	Coronation of Prince of Wales.....	400
1170	Treaty of Fretteville.....	402
	Return of Becket to England.....	407
	Assassination.....	412
	Reconciliation of the King at Avranches.....	419
	Penance at Canterbury.....	420
	Becket a saint.....	421

CHAPTER IX.

ALEXANDER III. — POPES TO CLOSE OF TWELFTH CENTURY.

1165	Alexander embarks for Italy.....	427
1167	Pestilence in Frederick's army.....	430
1176	Truce of Venice.....	434
1181	Death of Alexander III.....	438
Ibid.	Pope Lucius III.....	439
1185	Pope Urban III.....	440
1187	Pope Gregory VIII.....	444
	Pope Clement III.....	445
1189	Barbarossa's crusade and death.....	447
	Pope Cælestine III.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Coronation of the Emperor Henry.....	448
	Demolition of Tusculum.....	449
	Imprisonment of Richard I. of England.....	451
1194	The Emperor Henry in Italy.....	454
1195	Cruelties in Sicily.....	455
1196	Frederick elected King of the Romans.....	457
	Queen Constance.....	<i>ib.</i>
1197	Death of the Emperor Henry.....	458
1198	Death of Pope Cælestine III.....	<i>ib.</i>

BOOK IX.

INNOCENT III.

CHAPTER I.

ROME AND ITALY.

A.D.		PAGE
	The Papal autoeracy.....	460
	Its growth.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Effect of Crusades.....	464
	Innocent III.....	467
1160 or 1161	Birth of Innocent.....	468
	Education and connections.....	<i>ib.</i>
1190	Cardinalate.....	469
1198	Election to Papacy.....	470
	State of Christendom.....	472
1198-1202	I. The City of Rome.....	473
	Hatred of Rome and Viterbo.....	475
	Orsini and Scotti.....	477
	II. Italy.....	479
	Markwald — Conrad of Lutzenberg.....	480
1198	Queen Constantia.....	483
	Markwald before Monte Casino.....	486
1199	Markwald excommunicated.....	487
1201	Walter of Brienne.....	490
1202	Death of Markwald.....	493
	Frederick II. — his youth.....	494

CHAPTER II.

INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE.

1198	Philip the Swabian, King of the Romans.....	497
<i>ibid.</i>	Otho of Brunswick.....	<i>ib.</i>

A.D.		PAGE
1198	Conduct of Innocent.....	500
	Coronation of Philip.....	502
	Civil war.....	503
	Innocent's declaration.....	504
1199	Envoys to Rome.....	507
	War renewed.....	509
1200	Pope Innocent's Deliberation.....	510
	Activity of Innocent.....	514
1201	Coronation of Otho.....	515
	Addresses of the German Princes.....	516
1198-1208	Ten years' war.....	522
1207	Absolution of Philip.....	524
1208	Murder of Philip.....	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER III.

INNOCENT AND THE EMPEROR OTHO IV.

1209	Otho Emperor — Crowned in Rome.....	527
	Enmity between Innocent and Otho.....	528
1211	Otho excommunicated.....	530
<i>Ibid.</i>	Movements in Germany.....	531
	Overtures to Frederick.....	532
1212	Otho in Germany.....	533
	Frederick King of the Romans.....	536
1214	Battle of Bouvines.....	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER IV.

INNOCENT AND PHILIP AUGUSTUS OF FRANCE.

	Monarchy of France.....	538
1196	Marriage of Philip with Ingeburga of Denmark....	540
	Agnes of Meran.....	542
1198	Innocent's letter on the marriage of Philip Augustus.....	<i>ib.</i>

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.

xiii

A.D.		PAGE
1199	Interdict	544
	Wrath of Philip Augustus.....	547
1200	Innocent inflexible.....	549
	Council of Soissons.....	553
	Death of Agnes of Meran.....	554

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK VII. (CONTINUED.)

CHAPTER VI.

THE CRUSADES.

THIS vast subject, the Crusades, with all its causes and consequences, demands its place in the History of Latin Christianity, but must submit to be limited to an extent perhaps not quite commensurate to its importance.

The sanctity of the Holy Land, the scene of the Saviour's life and death, untraceable in the first records of the religion, had grown up, as the faith became the mistress of the whole inward nature of man, of the imagination as well as the moral sentiment, into almost a part of the general, if undefined, creed. Pilgrimage may be considered as belonging to the universal religion of man. Some sacred spots, connected either with the history of the faith or with some peculiar manifestation of the Deity, have ever concentrated the worshippers within their precincts, or drawn them together at periodical intervals to revive their pious emotions, to partake in the divine influences still supposed to be emanating from the holy ground, or to approach nearer

to the present and locally-indwelling godhead. From the lowest Fetichism up to Christianity itself this general and unconquerable propensity has either been sanctioned by the religion or sprung up out of it. Like the other more sublime and purely spiritual truths of the Gospel, the impartial ubiquity of God, the equable omnipresence of the Redeemer and the Holy Spirit throughout the whole universe and in the soul of every true believer, became too vague and unsubstantial, at least for the popular faith. It might seem an inevitable consequence of the Incarnation of the Godhead in human nature, that man should lean, as it were, more strongly on this kindred and comprehensible Saviour than on the same Saviour when retired into his remoter divinity. Everything which approximated the human Saviour to the heart and understanding was cherished with deep reverence. Even in the coldest and most unimaginative times the traveller to the Holy Land seems to enjoy a privilege enviable to the Christian, who, considering its natural effects on the religious emotions, will not venture to disdain the blameless at least, if not beneficial, excitement. The objective reality which arises from the actual places where the Saviour was born, lived, rose from the grave, ascended into heaven, works back upon the inward or subjective faith in the heart of the believer. Where the presence, the being of the Redeemer, is more intensely felt, there it is thought to dwell with greater power.

The Holy Land was very early visited by Christian pilgrims. The supposed discovery of the sacred sepulchre, with all the miraculous legend of the Emperor's vision, the disinterment of the true cross, the magnificent church built over the sepulchre by the devout He-

lena and her son Constantine, were but the consequences and manifestations of a preëxistent and dominant enthusiasm. This high example immeasurably strengthened and fed the growing passion.

It is remarkable, however, to find among those who yielded in other respects to the more materializing influences of the dominant Christianity The Fathers on Pilgrimages, 1828. some who attempted to maintain on this point a lofty spirituality. Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine,¹ even Jerome, remonstrated against the dangerous and unnecessary journey to such remote lands; dangerous to the virtue especially of the female sex, unnecessary to him who might worship God with equal fervor in every region. Others of the Fathers during the fourth century strongly opposed the more sublime tenet of the divine omnipresence to the sanctity of peculiar places; the superiority of a quiet holy life in any part of the world, to the wandering over sea and land, east or west, to seek more intimate assurance of the divine presence.

Jerome, as is not unusual with him, is vehement on both sides of the question. While he himself was revelling, as it were, in all the luxury of this religious excitement, and, by his example, drawing multitudes, especially the noble females of Rome, who followed his steps and would not be divided from the object of their pious friendship, to the Holy Land; at the same time he dissuades his friend Paulinus from the voyage, declares that heaven is equally accessible from Britain

¹ Compare the celebrated letter of Gregory of Nyssa. Dominus non dixit, vade in Orientem, et quare justitiam; naviga usque ad Occidentem, ut accipias indulgentiam. — Augustin. Sermo. de Martyr. Verb. Noli longa itinera meditari: ubi credis, ubi (ibi) venis: ad eum enim qui ubique est, amando venitur non navigando. — Serm. i. de Verb. Apost. Petri.

as from Palestine,¹ and laments with a kind of selfish querulousness the crowds which from all quarters throng the sacred places. His example was more powerful than his precept.

During the following centuries pilgrimage become the ruling passion of the more devout. The lives of Saints teem with accounts of their pious journeys. Itineraries were drawn up by which pilgrims might direct their way from the banks of the Rhine to Jerusalem. It was a work of pious munificence to build and endow hospitals along the roads for the reception of pilgrims. These pilgrims were taken under the protection of the law; they were exempt from toll, and commended by kings to the hospitality of their subjects. Charlemagne ordered that through his whole realm they were to be supplied at least with lodging, fire, and water.² In some religious houses the statutes provided for their entertainment. In Jerusalem there were public caravansaries for their reception. Gregory the Great sent money to Jerusalem to build a splendid hospital. The pilgrim set forth amid the blessings and prayers of his kindred or community, with the simple accoutrements which announced his design — the staff, the wallet, and the scallop-shell: he returned a privileged, in some sense a sanctified, being.³ Pilgrimage expiated all sin. The bathing in the Jordan was, as it were, a second baptism, and washed away all the

¹ De Hierosolymis et de Britannîâ æqualiter patet aula cœlestis. — Epist. ad Paul.

² Capitul. A.D. 802. Ut in omni regno nostro neque dives, neque pauper, peregrinis hospitia denegare audeat: id est sive peregrinis propter Deum ambulantiibus per terram, sive cuilibet itineranti. Propter amorem Dei et propter salutem animæ suæ tectum et focum et aquam nemo illi deneget.

³ Compare Wilken, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, i. p. 10.

evil of the former life. The shirt which he had worn when he entered the holy city was carefully laid by as his winding-sheet, and possessed, it was supposed, the power of transporting him to heaven. Palestine was believed to be a land not merely of holy reminiscences, and hallowed not only by the acts of the Saviour, but by the remains also of many saints. Places had already, by the pious invention and belief of the monks, been set apart for every scene in the Gospels or in early Christian history — the stable in Bethlehem, the garden of Gethsemane, the height where the Ascension took place; the whole land was a land of miracle, each spot had its wonders to confirm its authenticity. From an early period the descent of the fire from heaven to kindle the lights around the holy sepulchre had been played off before the wondering worshippers. The privilege of beholding Jerusalem and the sacred places was not the only advantage of the pilgrim. There was the great emporium of relics; and the pilgrim returned bearing with him a splinter of the true cross, or some other memorial of the Saviour, of the Virgin Mother, the apostles, or some earlier saint. The prodigal demand did not in the least drain the inexhaustible supply. These relics bore a high price in the West. At a later period commercial speculation in less sacred goods mingled with the devout aspirations after the Holy Land; and the silks, jewels, spices, paper, and other products of the East, were brought home from Palestine by the pious but not unworldly merchants of Venice, Pisa, Marseilles, and even of France and Germany.

Down to the conquest of Jerusalem by Chosroes the Persian the tide of pilgrimage flowed uninterrupted

Pilgrimages
unchecked. to the Holy Land. The victory of Heraclius and the recovery of the true Cross from the hands of the fire-worshippers reëstablished the peaceful communication ; and throughout this whole period the pilgrims had only to encounter the ordinary accidents, privations, and perils of a long journey.

Nor did the capture of Jerusalem by the Mohammedans at first break off this connection between Christendom and the birth- and burial-place of the Redeemer. To the Mohammedans Jerusalem was no indifferent possession ; it was sacred, if in a less degree than Mecca. It had been visited by their prophet ; once, according to their legend, in a mysterious and supernatural manner. The prophet had wavered between Jerusalem and Mecca as the Kebla of prayer for his disciples. The great religious ancestor of the Jews was also that of the Arabs ; the holy men and prophets of Israel were held in honor by the new faith ; the Korân admitted the supreme sanctity, though not the divinity, of Jesus. On the surrender of Jerusalem to the Caliph Omar, Christianity was allowed to perform all its rites though shorn of their pomp and publicity.¹ Their bells might no longer peal over the city ; their processions were forbidden ; they were to allow without resistance the conversion of Christians to Islamism ; to keep themselves distinct by name, dress, and language ; to pay tribute, and to acknowledge the sovereign power of the Caliph. They were constrained to behold the mosque of Omar usurp the site of the ancient Temple of Jerusalem. Yet pilgrimage was not as the worship of images to those stern Iconoclasts. It was a part of

¹ They might not speak Arabic, the holy language. Compare vol ii. page 159.

religion so common with their own belief, that they were rather disposed to respect than to despise this mark of attachment in the Christians to their own prophet. The pious therefore soon began to flock again in undiminished numbers to Mohammedan as to Christian Jerusalem.

In the plan of his great Christian Empire Charlemagne threw the shadow of his protection over the Christians in the remotest parts of the world. Not merely did he assist the churches in Syria with large alms, he entered into treaties for their protection with the Mohammedan rulers. In his amicable intercourse with Haroun Al-Raschid, the courteous Caliph bestowed on him no gift more precious than the keys of the holy sepulchre. At the great millennial period, the close of the tenth and the commencement of the eleventh century, the strong religious movement, which arose from the expectation of the Lord's coming to judgment, wrought with no less intensity on the pilgrimages to the Holy Land than on the other religious services. Men crowded to Jerusalem, as to the scene of the Lord's revelation in glory, to be witnesses of the great assize in the valley of Jehoshaphat. They were eager not merely to visit, but, if their death anticipated the last day, to die in the Holy Land.

The wars which followed the fall of the Caliphate had towards this time made Syria less secure; more than once it had been the field of battle to contending parties; and in the year 1010 there was a fierce persecution of the Christians by Hakim, the fanatic Sultan of Egypt. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and other Christian buildings in Jerusalem and the neighborhood, were razed to the ground.

Increasing
danger of
pilgrimages.

The persecution of the Christians in Palestine led to a furious persecution of the Jews in France. Rumors spread abroad that the Jews of Orleans had sent intelligence to Sultan Hakim of a meditated invasion of the Holy Land by the Christians; and this had stirred up his slumbering fanaticism. It was an awful omen to the Jews, probably had some effect in producing those more terrible calamities which awaited them at the commencement of the actual Crusades. Hakim, however, himself repented or grew weary of the persecution, or perhaps dreaded the vengeance of the maritime powers of Italy, now becoming formidable to all the coasts of the Mediterranean. The pilgrims were permitted to resume their interrupted devotions; they had no great peril to encounter and no degrading indignity to undergo, except the payment of a toll on the entrance to Jerusalem, established soon after this time by the Mohammedan rulers. This might sometimes be a grievous affliction to the poorer pilgrims, but it gave an opportunity for the more wealthy to display their pious munificence by defraying the cost of their admission.

Throughout the earlier half of the century men of all ranks, princes like Robert of Normandy, lordly bishops like those of Germany, headed pilgrimages. Humble monks and even peasants found their way to the Holy Land, and returned to awaken the spirit of religious adventure by the account of their difficulties and perils — the passionate enthusiasm by the wonders of the Holy Land.

Now, however, the splendid, polished, and more tolerant Mohammedanism of the earlier Caliphs had sunk before the savage yet no less warlike Turks. This

race, of the Mongol stock, had embraced all that was enterprising, barbarous, and aggressive, rejecting all that was humane or tending to a higher civilization in Mohammedanism. They were more fanatic Islamites than the followers of the Prophet, than the Prophet himself. The Seljukians became masters of Jerusalem, and from that time the Christians of Palestine, from tributary subjects became despised slaves; the pilgrims, from respected guests, intruders whose hateful presence polluted the atmosphere of pure Islamism. But neither the tyranny nor the outrages perpetrated by these new lords of Jerusalem arrested the unexhausted passion for pilgrimage, which became to some even a more praiseworthy and noble act of devotion from its perils.¹ The pilgrim might become a martyr. Year after year came back the few survivors of a long train of pilgrims, no longer radiant with pious pride at the accomplishment of their holy purpose, rich in precious relics or even the more costly treasures of the East; but stealing home, famished, wounded, mutilated, with lamentable tales of their own sufferings and of those who had died of the ill-usage of the barbarous unbelievers.

At length the afflictions of the Christians found a voice which woke indignant Europe — an apostle who could rouse warlike Latin Christendom to encounter with equal fanaticism this new outburst of the fanaticism of Islam. This was the mission of the hermit Peter.

¹ Lambert the historian performed a furtive pilgrimage. He was much alarmed lest his abbot (of Hertzfeld), without whose permission he set forth, should die without having forgiven him. He speaks of having incurred extreme peril, and of having returned to his monastery, quasi *ex impiis rediivus*. We should have been glad to have heard his own perils described by so powerful a writer. — Sub ann. 1059.

Latin Christendom was already in some degree prepared for this great confederacy. A league of Earlier schemes of Crusades. the whole Christian world against the Mohammedans had expanded before Gerbert, Silvester II. The Cæsar of the West, his master Otho III., was to add at least Palestine to the great Christian realm.¹ It was among the bold visions which had floated before the imagination of Gregory VII.² His strong sagacity, aided no doubt by good intelligence, had discerned the revolution in the spirit of Mohammedanism from the Turkish superiority. Hildebrand's more immediate object, however, was not the recovery of the Holy Land, but the defence of the Greek Empire, which was now threatened by the advance of the irresistible Seljukians into Asia Minor. The repression of Mohammedanism on all sides, in Italy especially, where it had more than once menaced Rome itself, conspired with the one paramount object of Hildebrand, the subjugation of Christendom to the See of Rome, and the unity of the Church under the supremacy of the Pope, to whom all temporal powers were to own their subordination. The Greek Empire was to render its allegiance to the Pontiff as the price of its protection from the Turks; it was to become an integral and essential part of the spiritual Empire. Gregory had intimated his design of placing himself at the head of this Crusade, which was at once to consolidate and secure from foreign and infidel aggression the ecclesiastical monarchy of the West. But the deliverance of the decrepit, unrespected, and often hostile Empire of the East would have awakened no powerful movement in

¹ Gerbert's letter in the name of Jerusalem. In Murat. R. I. S. iii. 400

² Compare Gregory's Regesta, i. 36, i. 49, ii. 31.

Latin Christendom: the fall of Constantinople would have startled too late the tardy fears and sympathies of the West. The ambassadors of Alexius Comnenus at Piacenza were received with decent respect, but with no passionate impulse. The letters from the East, imploring aid, had no power to hush and suspend the hostilities which distracted the West. If not heard with indifference, they left but superficial and evanescent impressions on the minds even of those who had most reason to dread the progress of the Mohammedan arms.

For the conquest of the Holy Land a zealous Pope might alone in favorable times have raised a great Christian army; he might have enlisted numbers of warlike and adventurous nobles, even sovereigns, in the cause. But humbler and more active instruments were wanting for a popular and general insurrection in favor of the oppressed and afflicted pilgrims, for the restoration of the Holy Land to the dominion of the Cross. All great convulsions of society are from below.

Peter the Hermit is supposed, but only supposed, to have been of gentle birth. He was of igno-^{Peter the} ble stature, but with a quick and flashing eye; ^{Hermit.} his spare, sharp person seemed instinct with the fire which worked within his restless soul. He was a Frank (of Amiens in Picardy), and therefore spoke most familiarly the language of that people, ever ready for adventurous warfare, especially warfare in the cause of religion. Peter had exhausted, without satisfying the cravings of his religious zeal, all the ordinary excitements, the studies, the austerities and mortifications, the fasts and prayers of a devout life. Still yearning for more powerful emotions, he had retired into the

solitude of the strictest and severest cloister. There his undoubting faith beheld in the visions of his disturbed and enthralled imagination revelations from heaven. In those days such a man could not but undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, more especially in times when martyrdom might be his reward. The deeper his feelings at visiting the holy places, the more strong would be his sorrow and indignation at their desecration by their rude and cruel masters. Peter saw with a bleeding heart the sufferings and degradation of his brethren; his blood turned to fire; the martial Frank was not extinct within him. In an interview with Simeon, the persecuted patriarch, he ventured to rebuke his despondency. When Simeon deplored the hopeless weakness of the Byzantine Empire, the natural lords and protectors of the Christians in Syria, Peter fearlessly promised him the succor of Western Christendom. His vow seemed to obtain the ratification of God. Prostrate in the temple he heard, as it were, the voice of our Lord himself, "Rise, Peter, go forth to make known the tribulations of my people; the hour is come for the delivery of my servants, for the recovery of the holy places!"

Peter fully believed in his own mission, and was A.D. 1094. therefore believed by others. He landed in Italy, he hastened to Rome. The Pope, Urban, was kindled by his fervor, acknowledged him as a Prophet, and gave full sanction to his announcement of the immediate deliverance of Jerusalem.

The Hermit traversed Italy, crossed the Alps, with indefatigable restlessness went from province to province, from city to city. His appearance commanded attention, his austerity respect, his language instant-

neous and vehement sympathy. He rode on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare; his dress was a long robe girt with a cord, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest stuff. He preached in the pulpits, in the roads, in the market-places. His eloquence was that which stirs the heart of the people, for it came from his own, brief, figurative, full of bold apostrophes; it was mingled with his own tears, with his own groans; he beat his breast; the contagion spread throughout his audience. His preaching appealed to every passion, to valor and shame, to indignation and pity, to the pride of the warrior, the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian, to the love of the Brethren, to the hatred of the Unbeliever, aggravated by his insulting tyranny, to reverence for the Redeemer and the Saints, to the desire of expiating sin, to the hope of eternal life. Sometimes he found persons who, like himself, had visited the Holy Land; he brought them forth before the people, and made them bear witness to what they had seen or what they had suffered. He appealed to them as having beheld Christian blood poured out wantonly as water, the foulest indignities perpetrated on the sacred places in Jerusalem. He invoked the Holy Angels, the Saints in Heaven, the Mother of God, the Lord himself, to bear witness to his truth. He called on the holy places — on Sion, on Calvary, on the Holy Sepulchre, to lift up their voices and implore their deliverance from sacrilegious profanation: he held up the Crucifix, as if Christ himself were imploring their succor.

His influence was extraordinary, even beyond the immediate object of his mission. Old enemies came to be reconciled; the worldliest to forswear the world; prel-

ates to entreat the hermit's intercession. Gifts showered upon him; he gave them all to the poor, or as dowries for loose women, whom he provided with husbands. His wonders were repeated from mouth to mouth; all ages, both sexes, crowded to touch his garments; the very hairs which dropped from his mule were caught and treasured as relics.

Western Christendom, particularly France, was thus prepared for the outburst of militant religion. Council of Clermont. Nothing was wanted but a plan, leaders, and organization. Such was the state of things when Pope Urban presented himself to the Council of Clermont, in Auvergne.

Where all the motives which stir the mind and heart, the most impulsive passion, and the profoundest policy, conspire together, it is impossible to discover which has the dominant influence in guiding to a certain course of action. Urban, no doubt, with his strong religiousness of character, was not superior to the enthusiasm of his times; to him the Crusade was the cause of God. This is manifest from the earnest simplicity of his memorable speech in the Council. No one not fully possessed by the frenzy could have communicated it. At the same time, no event (to this his discerning mind could not be blind) could be more favorable, or more opportune for the advancement of the great Papal object of ambition, the acknowledged supremacy over Latin Christendom; or for the elevation of Urban himself over the rival Pope and the temporal Sovereigns his enemies. Placing himself at the head of this vast popular movement, he left his rival at an immeasurable distance below him in general reverence. He rose to no less a height over the temporal Sovereigns.

The author of the Crusades was too holy a person, too manifest a vicegerent of Christ himself, for men either to question his title or circumscribe his authority. Thus the excommunication of the King of France, like the earthquake during the victory of Hannibal at Thrasymene, passed almost without notice.

Never, perhaps, did a single speech of man work such extraordinary and lasting results as that of Urban II. at the Council of Clermont.

*Speech of
Urban II.*

Urban, as a native of France, spoke, no doubt, the language of the country;¹ his speech has survived only in the colder and more stately ecclesiastical Latin; and probably has preserved but few of those pathetic and harrowing details of the cruelty, the licentiousness, the sacrilege of the Turks, which told most effectively on his shuddering and maddening audience.² He dwelt on the sanctity, on the wonders of the land of promise; the land chosen of God, to whom all the earth belonged as his own inheritance; the land of which the history had been recorded both in the Old and New Testament; of this land the foul Infidels were now the lords — of the Holy City itself, hallowed by the Life and Death of the Saviour. Whose soul melted not within; whose bowels were not stirred with shame and sorrow? The Holy Temple had become not only a den of thieves, but the dwelling-place of Devils. The churches, even that of the Holy Sep-

¹ *Certatim currunt Christi purgare sepulchrum*

Francigenus cunctus populus, de quo fuit ortus

Urbanus Pastor.

DONIZO.

² There are three copies of Urban's speech, unless they are, as is most probable, different speeches delivered on different occasions: one in William of Tyre, one in William of Malmesbury, one printed from a MS. in the Vatican in the Concilia.

ulchre itself, had become stalls for cattle, and Christian men were massacred and Christian women ravished within the holy precincts. The Heavenly fire had ceased to descend; the Lord would not visit his defiled sanctuary. While Christians were shedding Christian blood, they were sinfully abandoning this sacred field for their valor, and yielding up their brethren in Christ to the yoke, to the sword of the Unbeliever: they were warring on each other, when they ought to be soldiers of Christ. He assured them that the Saviour himself, the God of armies, would be their leader and their guide in battle. There was no passion which he left unstirred. "The wealth of your enemies shall be yours; ye shall plunder their treasures. Ye serve a commander who will not permit his soldiers to want bread, or a just reward for their services.¹ He offered absolution for all sins (there was no crime — murder, adultery, robbery, arson — which might not be redeemed by this act of obedience to God); absolution without penance to all who would take up arms in this sacred cause. It was better to fall in battle than not to march to the aid of the Brethren; he promised eternal life to all who should suffer the glorious calamity of death in the Holy Land, or even in the way to it. The Crusader passed at once into Paradise. For himself, he must remain aloof; but, like a second Moses, while they were slaughtering the Amalekites, he would be perpetually engaged in fervent and prevailing prayer for their success."²

¹ Facultates etiam inimicorum nostrorum vestræ erunt; quoniam et illorum thesauros exspoliabitis. . . . Tali Imperatori militare debetis cui panis deesse non potest, cui quæ rependat, nulla desint stipendia. This is from the Vatican speech. I have taken the liberty of compiling from all three.

² This likewise is from the Vatican speech.

The Pontiff could scarcely conclude his speech ; he was interrupted by ill-suppressed murmurs of grief and indignation. At its close, one loud ^{Crusade} and simultaneous cry broke forth : “ It is the will of God ! it is the will of God ! ” All ranks, all classes, were seized with the contagious passion ; the assembly declared itself the army of God. Not content with his immediate success, the Pope enjoined on all the Bishops to preach instantly, unremittingly, in every diocese, the imperative duty of taking up arms to redeem the Holy Sepulchre. The epidemic madness spread with a rapidity inconceivable, except from the knowledge how fully the mind and heart of man were prepared to imbibe the infection. France, including both its Frank and Norman population, took the lead ; Germany, of colder temperament and distracted by its own civil contentions, the Imperialist faction from hatred of the Pope, moved more tardily and reluctantly ; in Italy it was chiefly the adventurous Normans who crowded to the war ; in England the Normans were too much occupied in securing their vast possessions, the Anglo-Saxon population too much depressed, to send large numbers of soldiers. All Europe, however, including the Northern nations, except Spain, occupied with her own crusade in her own realm, sent their contingent, either to the wild multitudes who swarmed forth under Walter the Pennyless, or the more regular army under Godfrey of Boulogne. The Crusade was no national war of Italy, France, or Germany against the Egyptian Empire of the Fatimites, or the Seljukian Sultan of Iconium : it was a war of Christendom against Mohammedanism. No government hired the soldiers, unless so far as the feudal chief summoned his

vassals to accompany him ; nor provided transports and the artillery and implements of war, or organized a commissariat, or nominated to the chief command. Each was a volunteer, and brought his own horse, arms, accoutrements, provisions. In the first disastrous expeditions, under Peter the Hermit and Walter the Pennyless, the leaders were designated by popular acclamation or by bold and confident self-election. The general deference and respect for his admirable character and qualifications invested Godfrey of Boulogne in the command of the first regular army. It was fortunate, perhaps, that none of the great Sovereigns of Europe joined the first Crusade ; the Emperor and the King of France were under excommunication ; Conrad, King of Italy, too necessary to the Pope to be spared from Italy ; in William Rufus was wanting the great impulse, religious faith. The ill success of the later Crusades, undertaken by Emperors and Kings, their frequent want of ability for supreme command when alone, their jealousies when allied, show that a league of princes of the second rank, though not without their intrigues and separate interests, was better suited for this kind of expedition.

The results of these wars, rather than the wars themselves, must find their place in the history of Christianity. Urban II. lived to hear hardly more than the disasters and miseries of his own work. His faith had the severe trial of receiving the sad intelligence of the total destruction of the myriads who marched into Hungary and perished on the way, by what was unjustly considered the cruelty of the Hungarians and treachery of the Greeks ; scarcely one of these ever reached the borders of

Results of
Crusades.

the Holy Land. His depression may have been allayed by the successes of the army under Godfrey of Boulogne: he heard of the capture of Antioch, but died before the tidings of the fall of Jerusalem on the 15th of July, 1099, could reach Rome.

The Crusades — contemplated not with cold and indifferent philosophy, but with that lofty spiritualism of faith which cannot consent to limit Causes of Crusades. the ubiquitous God, and Saviour, and Holy Spirit to any place, or to any peculiar mountain or city, and to which a war of religion is essentially, irreconcilably oppugnant to the spirit of Christianity — may seem the height of human folly. The Crusades, if we could calculate the incalculable waste of human life from first to last (a waste without achieving any enduring result,) and all the human misery which is implied in that loss of life, may seem the most wonderful frenzy which ever possessed mankind. But from a less ideal point of view — a view of human affairs as they have actually evolved under the laws or guidance of Divine Providence — considerations suggest themselves which mitigate or altogether avert this contemptuous or condemnatory sentence. If Christianity, which was to mould and fuse the barbarous nations into one great European society — if Latin Christianity and the political system of the West were to be one in limits and extent, it was compelled to assume this less spiritual, more materialistic form. Reverence for holy places — that intense passion which first showed itself in pilgrimages, afterwards in the Crusade — was an inseparable part of what has been called mediæval Christianity. Nor was this age less inevitably an age of war — an age in which human life, even if it had not been

thrown away on so vast a scale on one object, would hardly have escaped other (probably hardly less extensive) destruction. It would be bold to say how much the Crusades, at such a time, enhanced the mass of human suffering. Those who strewed the plains of Hungary or of Asia Minor with their bones — who for above a century watered the soil of Palestine with their blood — would probably have fallen in great numbers in nearer and more intestine wars; wars waged for a less generous and unselfish end. The Crusades consummated, and the Christian Church solemnly blessed and ratified, the unnatural it might be, but perhaps necessary and inevitable, union between Christianity and the Teutonic military spirit. Yet what but Christian warlike fanaticism could cope with the warlike Mohammedan fanaticism which had now revived by the invasion of the Turks, a race more rude and habitually predatory and conquering than the Arabs of the Prophet, and apparently more incapable of yielding to those genial influences of civilization which had gradually softened down the Caliphs of Damascus, Bagdad, Cairo, and Cordova, to splendid and peaceful monarchs? Few minds were, perhaps, far-seeing enough to contemplate the Crusades, as they have been viewed by modern history, as a blow struck at the heart of the Mohammedan power; as a politic diversion of the tide of war from the frontiers of the European kingdoms to Asia. Yet neither can this removal of the war to a more remote battle-field, nor the establishment of the principle that all Christian powers were natural allies against Mohammedan powers (though this principle, at a later period, gave way before European animosities and enmities), have been without important influence on the course of human affairs.

To this union of the military spirit of Europe and of Christianity each brought its dowry — the ^{Alliance of religious and military spirit.} military spirit its unmitigated ferocity, its wild love of adventure, its licentiousness, its contempt for human life, at times its generosity, and here and there touches of that chivalrous respect for females which had belonged to the Teutonic races, and was now mingled up with the religion. Christianity was content to bring its devotion without any of its humanizing influences, its fervent faith, which was assured of its everlasting reward, its strict obedience to all the outward ceremonial of religion, its earnest prayers, its profound humility. But it left out all restraining discipline of the violent and revengeful passions; it checked not the fury of conquest; allayed in no way the miseries of the strife. The knight, before the battle, was as devout as the bishop; the bishop, in the battle, no less ferocious than the knight. No one denied himself the full privilege of massacre or of plunder; it was rather a duty against unbelievers: the females of a conquered town had no better fate with a crusading, than with a Mohammedan soldiery.

The Crusades have been called, and justly, the heroic age of Christianity — the heroic age in ^{Heroic age of Christianity.} the ordinary, not the Christian sense, that of the Gospel — which would seek her own heroes rather among the martyrs and among the benefactors of mankind. It had all the violence, the rudeness, but also the grandeur, the valor, daring, endurance, self-sacrifice, wonderful achievements, the development of strength, even of craft, which belongs to such a period: the wisdom of Godfrey of Boulogne, the gallantry of Tancred of Hauteville, the subtlety of

Raimond of Toulouse; in later times the rivalry of the more barbarous Richard of England with the more courteous and polished Saladin. But in no point are the Crusades more analogous to the heroic ages of other times than in the elevation of the heroes of the war above the common herd of the soldiery.¹ In all wars the glory of the few is bought by the misery of the many. The superior armor and weapons, the fighting on horseback, as well as the greater skill in managing the weapons and the horse, no doubt the calmer courage, maintained the nobles as a martial and feudal aristocracy, who obtained all the glory and the advantages of their transient successes. Never, perhaps, were expeditions so utterly, hopelessly disastrous, so wildly prodigal of human life, as the *popular* Crusade, which set off first under Peter the Hermit. Of all this the blind enthusiasm of that day took as little notice as in later times did Godfrey's Frank knights in their poetic admiration of his exploits. In the fame of Godfrey's conquest of Jerusalem, in the establishment of that kingdom, no one under the rank of knight acquired honor, power, emolument. But since, in the account

¹ The Crusades ought to have been the heroic age of Christianity in poetry; but their Homer arose too late. At the time of the Crusades there was wanting a common language, or indeed any language already formed and approaching to the life and energy of the Homeric Greek; at the same time sufficiently vernacular and popular not to become antiquated in the course of time. Before the polite and gentle Tasso, even the Italian had lost the rudeness and picturesque simplicity of its Dantesque form: the religious enthusiasm had been subdued to a timorous orthodoxy, which trembled before the Inquisition; the martial spirit was that of the earlier romantic poems rather than the Crusader's fanatic love of battle and hatred of the Unbeliever. With all its exquisite and pathetic passages the "Jerusalem Delivered" is no Crusader's epic. Beautiful as a work of art, it is still a work of art. It is suited to the court of Ferrara rather than to the castle-hall of a chieftain returned after years of war from the Holy Land

of the Crusades, even more than in other parts of the Christian annals, the life, the reality, the character, even the terror and beauty, the poetry of the whole period, consists in the details, it is only in the acts and words of individuals that clearly transpire the workings of the religion of the times. The History of Christianity must leave those annals, as a separate province, and content itself with following out some of the more general results of those extraordinary and characteristic events. I will only relate two incidents: one illustrative of the frightfulness of this Holy War; one of the profound religion which, nevertheless, lay in the hearts of its leaders.

No barbarian, no infidel, no Saracen, ever perpetrated such wanton and cold-blooded atrocities ^{Incidents of the} of cruelty as the wearers of the Cross of ^{Crusades.} Christ (who, it is said, had fallen on their knees and burst into a pious hymn at the first view of the Holy City), on the capture of that city. Murder was mercy, rape tenderness, simple plunder the mere assertion of the conqueror's right. Children were seized by their legs, some of them plucked from their mothers' breasts and dashed against the walls, or whirled from the battlements. Others were obliged to leap from the walls; some tortured, roasted by slow fires. They ripped up prisoners to see if they had swallowed gold. Of 70,000 Saracens there were not left enough to bury the dead; poor Christians were hired to perform the office. Every one surprised in the Temple was slaughtered, till the reek from the dead bodies drove away the slayers. The Jews were burned alive in their synagogue. Even the day after, all who had taken refuge on the roofs, notwithstanding Tancred's

resistance, were hewn to pieces. Still later the few Saracens who had escaped (not excepting babes of a year old) were put to death to avenge the insults to the dead, and lest they should swell the numbers of the advancing Egyptian army. The ghost of Bishop Adhemar de Puy, the Legate; (he had died of the plague at Antioch) was seen in his sacerdotal habits partaking in the triumph, and it appears, not arresting the carnage.¹

Yet when Godfrey was unanimously saluted as sovereign of the conquered realm, to the universal admiration, he refused to be king: he would only be administrator, where the Saviour had been called a servant; he would wear no golden crown where the Redeemer had worn a crown of thorns.²

Return we to the effects of the expeditions to the Holy Land.

I. The first and more immediate result of the Crusades was directly the opposite to that which had been promised, and no doubt expected, by the advisers of these expeditions. Though not the primary, the security of the Eastern Christian Empire, and its consequent closer alliance with Latin Christendom, was at least a secondary object. Latin and Greek Christendom would become, if not one Empire, one indissoluble league: the Greek Church would become part of the kingdom of St. Peter. But instead of the

Estrangement of
the East.

¹ *Mulieres mucrone perfoderunt, infantes adhuc sugentes per plantam pedis e sinu matris aut cunabulis arreptos muris vel ostiorum liminibus allidentes fractis cervicibus, alios armis trucidarunt.* — Albert. Aquens. p. 281. *Alii illorum quos levius erat captibus obtruncabantur; alii autem sagittati de turribus saltare cogeabantur, alii vero diutissime torti et ignibus adusti.* — Hist. B. Sacri, p. 179. Compare the later historians of the Crusades, Wilken, Michaud, i. 411; Von Raumer (Hohenstaufen), i. 216.

² All the later authorities.

reconciliation of the Byzantine Empire with the West, the Crusade led to a more total estrangement; instead of blending the Churches into one, the hostility became more strong and obstinate. The Emperors of the East found their friends not less dangerous and destructive than their enemies could have been. Vast hordes of disorderly and undisciplined fanatics came swarming across the frontiers, trampling down everything in their way, and spreading desolation through the more peaceful and flourishing provinces. Already the Hungarians had taken up arms against these unwelcome strangers; and a Christian power had been the first to encounter the champions of the Cross. The leaders of the Crusade, the Hermit himself, and a soldier of fortune, Walter, who went by the name of the Pennyless, were altogether without authority, and had taken no steps to organize or to provide food for this immense population which they had set in motion. This army mainly consisted of the poorer classes, whose arms, such as they were, were their only possession. The more enthusiastic, no doubt, vaguely trusted to the protection of Providence; God would not allow the soldiers of his blessed Son to perish with want. The more thoughtful calculated on the hospitality of their Christian brethren. The pilgrims of old had found hospitals and caravansaries established for their reception; they had been fed by the inexhaustible bounty of the devout. But it had occurred to none that, however friendly, the inhabitants of Hungary and the Provinces of the Byzantine Empire, through which they passed, could not, without miracles, feed the swelling, and it seemed, never-ending swarm of strangers. Hunger led to plunder, plunder

to hostility, hostility hardened and inflamed to the most bitter mutual antipathy. Europe rung with denunciations of the inhospitality, the barbarity of these more than unbelievers, who were accused of secret intelligence and confederacy with the Mohammedans against the cause of Christ. The subtle policy of Alexius Comnenus, whose craft was in some degree successful in the endeavor to rid his subjects of this intolerable burden, was branded as the most malignant treachery. Hence mistrust, hatred, contempt, sprang up between the Greek and Latin Christians, which centuries could hardly have eradicated, even if they had been centuries of friendly intercourse rather than of aggravated wrong and unmingling hostility. The Greeks despised the Franks as rude and savage robbers; the Franks disdained the Greeks as wily and supple slaves.

The conduct of the more regular army, which took another and less destructive course, was restrained by some discipline, and maintained at first some courtesy, yet widened rather than closed this irreparable breach. The Emperor of the East found that his Western allies conquered not for him, but for themselves. Instead of considering Syria and Palestine as parts of the Eastern Empire, they created their own independent principalities, and owned no sovereignty in him who claimed to be the legitimate lord of those territories. There was a singular sort of feudal title made out to Palestine: God was the Sovereign owner; through the Virgin, of royal descent from the house of David, it descended to our Lord. At a later period the contempt of the Franks reached its height in their conquest of Constantinople, and the establishment of a Latin dynasty on the throne of the Eastern Emperors; contempt which

was amply repaid by the hatred of the Greeks, who, when they recovered the Empire, were only driven by hard necessity to cultivate any friendly alliance with the West.

This implacable temporal hostility did not tend to soften or reconcile the religious difference. The supremacy of the Pope became a sign, a bitter remembrancer of their subjugation. Even at the last hour, after the Council of Florence, the Eastern Church refused to surrender its freedom or to accept the creed of the West.

II. The Pope, the clergy, the monastic institutions, derived a vast accession of power, influence, and wealth from the Crusades. Already Urban, by placing himself at the head of the great movement, had enshrined himself in the general reverence, and to the Pope reverence was power and riches.¹ He had crushed his adversaries in the popular mind of great part of Christendom. He bequeathed this great legacy of preëminence to his successors. The Pope was general-in-chief of the armies of the faith. He assumed from the commencement, and maintained to the end of the Crusades, an enormous dispensing authority, to which no one ventured or was disposed to raise any objection; not a dispensing authority only from the penalties of sin in this world or the next, a mitigation of the pains of purgatory, or a remittal of those acts of penance which the Church commuted at her will: the taking the cross absolved, by his author-

¹ Compare Heeren's Essay on the influence of the Crusades, Werke, vol. ii., and Choiseul d'Aillecourt, who obtained the second prize from the French Academy. To these writers I would refer for the general effects on commerce, arts, and literature.

ity, from all temporal, civil, and social obligation. It substituted a new and permanent principle of obedience for feudal subordination. The Pope became the liege lord of mankind. His power commanded, though unhappily it could not enforce, a truce from all other wars throughout Christendom. The theory was the universal amicable alliance of all Christians against the common foe, the unbeliever: war therefore of Christian against Christian became treason against the sacred cause. The prince who took the cross left his dominions under the protection of the Holy See; but as the more ambitious, rapacious, and irreligious of the neighboring sovereigns were those who remained behind, this security was extremely precarious. But the noble became really exempt from most feudal claims; he could not be summoned to the banner of his Lord: even the bonds of the villein, the serf, and the slave were broken or enfeebled; they were free, if they could extricate themselves from a power which, in the eye of the Church, as interfering with the discharge of a higher duty, was lawless, to follow the cross.¹ Even the creditor could not arrest the debtor. The Crusader was the soldier of the Church, and this was his first allegiance which released him from all other. The Pope was thus invested in a kind of supremacy altogether new and unprecedented.

But though the acknowledged head and leader in

¹ Men were allowed to commute base or even capital punishments for perpetual exile to the Holy Land. James de Vitry complains bitterly of the degradation of the honor of the Crusades, and other evil consequences of this doctrine. *Viri sanguinum et filii mortis in patriâ suâ deprehensi in iniquitatibus et maleficiis suis, mutilationibus membrorum vel suspendiis adjudicati, prece vel pretio plerumque obtinebant, ut in terram promissionis sine spe revertendi, perpetuo condemnati exilio, remanerent. Hi autem non penitentiâ compuniti, &c.* — *Hist. Orient.* i. 82.

this universal league, no Pope was so rash or so adventurous as to commit himself to the actual perils of an expedition to the Holy Land. No Pope a Crusader.

Some pontiffs professed their intention, some made preparations to place themselves at the head of a crusading army. But from prudence or timidity, from circumstances or from design, Christendom was spared what might have been almost the fatal humiliation of defeat and disaster, the seeming abandonment by God of his vicar upon earth, the desecration, it might be, of his person by the hands of barbarous unbelievers, his captivity in a foreign land — fiery trials which might end in glorious martyrdom, but if not in martyrdom, might it not be in weakness? dare it be supposed in apostasy? No devout mind could contemplate the possibility, under the most awful ordeal ever encountered by flesh and blood, of a renegade Pope; still it might be well that even the remotest peril of such an appalling event should be avoided. He was spared, too, from being an eye-witness of the indescribable calamities, the bootless carnage, the sufferings from plague and famine, as well as from the enemy, by which the Crusades were distinguished from almost all other wars; and the more unseemly spectacle of the crimes, the cruelties, the unbridled licentiousness, the strife, and jealousies, and treacheries, which prevailed too often in the Christian camp, and would hardly have been overawed by his presence. The Pope, however, though not personally mingled up in this humiliating it might be, no doubt almost inevitably disenchanting and too frequently debasing intercourse with the wild soldiery, was present by his Legate. Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, was the representative of the Pope in the first Crusade; and

so, although the temporal princes assumed the right of election to the kingdom of Jerusalem, yet he was there to assert the right of ecclesiastical interference in the direction of a war waged for religious ends and under religious sanction.

But the hold on the human mind, which directly or indirectly accrued to the Pope in Europe from this right of levying war throughout Christendom against the unbeliever, of summoning, or at least enlisting, all mankind under the banner of the cross, could not but increase in its growth as long as the crusading frenzy maintained its power. The holy war was a means opened by God of atonement for sins, besides sacerdotal sanctity or devotion to the monastic life; a lower and easier kind of atonement for the vulgar, incapable of that higher religiousness. Who was beyond or above this motive?¹ Thus that which was at first a passion became a duty, and once recognized as a duty, it was a test by which the Pope could try the faith or the fidelity of his more contumacious spiritual subjects. To take the cross was the high price which might obtain absolution for the most enormous offence; and therefore, if the Pope so willed, he would be satisfied with nothing less. There were few sovereigns so cautious, or so superior to the dominant superstition, as not, in some period of enthusiasm or disaster, of ambition or affliction, either from the worldly desire of propitiating the favor of the Pope, or under the pangs of wounded

¹ Deus nostro tempore prælia sancta instituit, ut ordo equestris et vulgus oberrans, qui vetustæ Paganitatis exemplo in mutuas versabatur cædes, novum reperirent salutis promerendæ genus: ut nec funditus electa, ut fieri assolet monastica conversatione, seu religiosâ qualibet professione sæculum relinquere cogerentur; sed sub consuetâ licentiâ et habitu ex suo ipsorum officio Dei aliquatenus gratiam consequerentur. — Guido Abbas, p. 1076.

conscience, to entangle themselves with this irrevocable vow ; that vow at least which could only be annulled by the Pope, who was in general little disposed to relax his hold on his self-fettered subject. The inexorable taskmaster, to whom the king or prince had sold himself in the hour of need, either demanded the immediate service, or held the mandate in terror over his head to keep him under subjection. It will appear hereafter how the most dangerous antagonist of the papal power, the Emperor Frederick II., was trammelled in this inextricable bondage, from which he could not release himself even by fulfilling its conditions.

The legatine authority of the Pope expanded to a great extent in consequence of the Crusades.¹ Legatine authority of the Pope. Before this period an ecclesiastic, usually of high rank or fame, had been occasionally commissioned by the Pope to preside in local councils, to determine controversies, to investigate causes, to negotiate with sovereigns. As acting in the Pope's person, he assumed or exercised the right of superseding all ordinary jurisdiction, that of the bishops and even of the metropolitans. The Crusades gave an opportunity of sending legates into every country in Latin Christendom, in order to preach and to recruit for the Crusades, to urge the laity who did not take up the cross in person to contribute to the expenses of the war, to authorize or to exact the subsidies of the clergy. The public mind became more and more habituated to the presence, as it were, of the Pope by his representative, to the superseding of all authority in his name. The hierarchy, in such a cause, could not venture to resist the encroachment on their jurisdiction ; the exactions

¹ Compare Heeren, p. 147 ; Planck, ii. p. 631.

from the clergy, though still disguised under the semblance of a voluntary contribution, furnished a dangerous precedent for demands on the revenues of other churches for the use of Rome. Not only the secular clergy but the monasteries were bound to assign part of their revenues for the conquest of the Holy Land; with them, too, the free-will offering became a tax, and the principle was thus established of taxation for foreign purposes and by a superior authority.¹ The Pope became, to a certain degree, the absolute supreme lord, as far as the right of assessing burdens, at first for a specific object, at length for his own objects (whatever might appear so to his wisdom must be a worthy object), on the whole ecclesiastical property of Latin Christendom.

But to the clergy and to the monastic institutions the vast increase in their wealth and territorial possessions more than compensated for this, at first, light taxation. There may have been few, but doubtless there were some of all ranks up to princedoms, who in their reckless enthusiasm stripped themselves of all their goods, abandoned their lands and possessions, and reserved nothing but their sword, their horse, and a trifling sum for their maintenance, determined to seek either new possessions or a glorious and saintly grave in the Holy Land. If they had no heirs, it was a trifling sacrifice; if they had, it was a more praiseworthy and truly religious sacrifice to make over their

¹ The bishops in *partibus Infidelium* had their origin in the Crusades; as the Crusaders conquered, they founded or reëstablished sees. When their conquests fell back to the Mohammedans the bishops were obliged to fly: many took refuge in Rome. These being already invested in episcopal power, they were often employed as vicars-general in different countries, a new office of great importance to the Papal power.

estates to the Church ; this consummated the merit of him who had sunk every duty and every tie in the character of champion of the cross. But all were suddenly called upon for a large expenditure, to meet which they had made no provision. The private adventurer had to purchase his arms, his Milan or Damascus steel, his means of transport and provision ; the nobles and the princes, in proportion to their rank and territory, to raise, arm, and maintain their vassals. Multitudes were thus compelled to pledge or to alienate their property. The Jews were always at hand to receive in pawn or to purchase their personal possessions. But the Jews in most parts of Europe had no concern in the cultivation of the soil, in some could not be landed proprietors. Here and there prudent nobles, or even kings, might watch this favorable opening, when estates were thrown so prodigally and abundantly on the market. So William Rufus bought his elder brother's dukedom of Normandy.

But there was one wealthy body alone which was not deeply embarked in these costly undertakings — the Church. The bishops who took up the cross might possibly burden, they could not alienate, their estates. On the other hand, the clergy and the monasteries were everywhere on the spot to avail themselves of the embarrassments and difficulties of their neighbors. It was their bounden duty to increase to the utmost that which was called the property of God ; rapacity had long been a virtue, it was thought to have lost all its selfishness when exercised in behalf of the Church. Godfrey of Boulogne alienated part of his estates to the Bishop of Verdun ; he pledged another part to the Bishop of Liege. For at least two centuries this traf-

fic went silently on, the Church always receiving, rarely alienating; and this added to the ordinary offerings of devotion, the bequests of deathbed remorse, the exactions for hard-wrung absolution, the prodigal bribes of superstitious terror, the alms of pure and self-denying charity.¹ Whoever during the whole period of the Crusades sought to whom he might intrust his lands as guardian, or in perpetuity if he should find his grave or richer possessions in the Holy Land, turned to the Church, by whose prayers he might win success, by whose masses the sin which clung to the soul even of the soldier of the cross might be purged away. If he returned, he returned often a disappointed and melancholy man, took refuge from his despondent religious feelings in the cloister, and made over his remaining rights to his brethren. If he returned no more, the Church was in possession. The churchman who went to the Holy Land did not hold in himself the perpetual succession to the lands of his see or of his monastery; it was in the Church or in the fraternity.² Thus in every way the all-absorbing Church was still gathering in wealth, encircling new lands within her hallowed pale, the one steady merchant who in this vast traffic and sale of personal and of landed property never made a losing venture, but went on accumulating and still accumulating, and for the most part withdrawing the

¹ On sale or alienation of lands, see Robertson, Introduction to Charles V.; Choiseul d'Aillecourt, note 80.

² Heeren, Werke, p. 149. Rappelons-nous l'encan général des fiefs et de tous les biens des Croisés. Au milieu de tant de vendeurs empressés, il se présentait peu d'acquéreurs, autre que les Eglises et les Communautés religieuses, qui n'abandonnaient pas leur patrie, et qui pouvoient placer des sommes considérables. They gained the direct domain of many fiefs, by failure of heirs to those who perished in the Holy Land.—Choiseul d'Aillecourt, p. 90.

largest portion of the land in every kingdom into a separate estate, which claimed exemption from all burdens of the realm, until the realm was compelled into measures, violent often and iniquitous in their mode, but still inevitable. The Church which had thus peaceably despoiled the world was in her turn unscrupulously despoiled.

III. The Crusades established in the Christian mind the justice and the piety of religious wars. HOLINESS OF RELIGIOUS WARS. The history of Christianity for five centuries is a perpetual Crusade; in this spirit and on these principles every war against unbelievers, either in the general doctrines of Christianity or in the dominant forms, was declared, waged, maintained. The cross was almost invariably the banner, the outward symbol; the object was the protection or the enlargement of the boundaries of the Church. The first Crusades might be in some degree vindicated as defensive. In the long and implacable contest the Mohammedan had no doubt been the aggressor; Islam first declared general and irreconcilable war against all hostile forms of belief; the propagation of faith in the Korân was the avowed aim of its conquests. The extent and rapidity of those conquests enforced toleration; conversion could not keep pace with subjugation; but the unconverted, the Jewish, or the Christian sank to an inferior, degraded, and tributary population. Nor was the spirit of conquest and invasion either satiated by success or broken by discomfiture. Neither the secure possession of their vast Asiatic dominions of Egypt, Africa, and Spain, nor their great defeat by Charles Martel, quelled their aggressive ambition. They were constantly renewing hostilities in every accessible part of the East and West,

threatening or still further driving in the frontier of the Byzantine Empire, covering the Mediterranean with their fleets, subduing Sicily, and making dangerous inroads and settlements in Italy. New nations or tribes from the remoter East, with all the warlike propensities of the Arabs, but with the fresh and impetuous valor of young proselytes to the Korân, were constantly pouring forth from the steppes of Tartary, the mountain glens of the Caucasus or the Himalaya, and infusing new life into Mohammedanism. The Turks had fully embraced its doctrines of war to all of hostile faith in their fiercest intolerance; they might seem imperiously to demand a general confederacy of Christendom against their declared enemy. Even the oppressions of their Christian brethren, oppressions avowedly made more cruel on account of their religion, within the dominions of the Mohammedans, might perhaps justify an armed interference. The indignities and persecutions to which the pilgrims, who had been respected up to this period, were exposed, the wanton and insulting desecration of the holy places, were a kind of declaration of war against everything Christian.

But it is more easy in theory than in fact to draw the line between wars for the defence and for the propagation of the faith. Religious war is too impetuous and eager not to become a fanaticism. From this period it was an inveterate, almost uncontested tenet, that wars for religion were not merely justifiable, but holy and Christian, and if holy and Christian, glorious above all other wars. The unbeliever was the natural enemy of Christ and of his Church; if not to be converted to be punished for the crime of un-

belief, to be massacred, exterminated by the righteous sword.

Charlemagne indeed had already carried simultaneously conquest and conversion into the forests of Germany ; but the wars against the Saxons still pretended to be defensive, to be the repulse of invasions on their part of the territories of the Empire, and the wanton destruction of churches within the Christian frontier. Baptism was among the terms of capitulation offered to conquered tribes, and accepted as the only secure guaranty for their future observance of peace.

But the actual crusades against Mohammedanism had not begun before they were diverted from their declared object — before they threw off all ^{Crusades} pretence to be considered defensive wars. ^{aggressive.} The people had no sooner arms in their ^{The Jews.} hands than they turned them against the first enemies, according to the new code of Christ and of the Church, the unfortunate Jews. The frightful massacre of this race in all the flourishing cities in Germany and along the Rhine by the soldiers of the Cross seemed no less justifiable and meritorious than the subjugation of the more remote enemies of the Gospel. Why this fine discrimination between one class of unbelievers and another? Shall zeal presume to draw distinctions between the wicked foes of the Church? Even in the later Crusades it was an act of heroic Christian courage: no one but a St. Bernard would have dared, or dared with success, to distinguish with nice justice between the active and passive adversaries of the faith, the armed Saracen and the defenceless Jew. Long-suppressed hatred, jealousy of their wealth, revenge for their extortions, which prob-

ably, when almost every one was at their mercy, were intolerable enough (the Jew perhaps might, on his side, consider the invasion of the Holy Land an usurpation of his inalienable territory by the Christian, and might impose harder terms for his assistance in the purchase of arms and other provisions for that end); many old and many recent feelings of antipathy might still further designate the Jew as the enemy of the Christian cause; but it was as the Unbeliever, not the wealthy extortioner, that he was smitten with the sword. The Crusaders would not go in search of foreign foes of the Gospel, and leave in their homes men equally hateful, equally obstinate, equally designated for perdition in this world and in the next.

That which was lawful, just, and meritorious against the Jew and Mohammedan was so against the idolater. Out of Orders of Christian Knights for the defence of the Christian conquests in Palestine arose Orders of armed Apostles, for the conversion of the Heathen in the North of Germany. The Teutonic Knights were the brethren in arms of the Templars and Hospitallers of the Holy Land.

The heretic was no less odious, and therefore no less dangerous an enemy to the faith: he was a
Crusades against heretics. renegade to the true creed of the Gospel, a revolted subject of the Church. Popular opinion, as well as the decrees of the Pope, hallowed the exterminating wars against the Albigenses and other schismatics of the South of France, as undertaken for the cause of God. They were openly designated as Crusades. Simon de Montfort was as much the champion of the true faith as Godfrey of Boulogne. The In-

quisition itself was a Crusade in a more peaceful and judicial form; it rested on the same principles, and executed against individuals that punishment which the Crusades accomplished by the open and indiscriminate carnage of war. Crusades were even preached and proclaimed against persons not charged with ^{Against the} heresy. The Popes scrupled not to unfold ^{Pope's enu-} the banner of the Cross against any of their disobedient sons. The expedition against John of England by Philip of France, to reduce the refractory King to his obedience under his Papal liege lord, was called a Crusade. Philip of France was summoned to take arms as a true vassal of the Church against a rival Sovereign. At length every enemy of the political power of the Pope in Italy became as a heretic or an unbeliever. Crusades will hereafter be levied against those who dared impiously to attempt to set bounds to the temporal aggrandizement of the Roman See, or to the personal or nepotic ambition of the ruling Pontiff.

A new world of heathens was opened before this great dominant principle was effaced or weak- ^{America.} ened, at least in the Spanish mind. Spain had owed almost her national existence, her supremacy within her own peninsula to crusades of centuries with the Mohammedans. The conquest of Mexico by Cortes was a crusade; the rapacity, and avarice, and passion for adventure in his followers, disguised itself, even to them, as a pious act for the propagation of the Gospel.

Philip II. justified his exterminating wars in the Low Countries and his hostilities against ^{Philip II.} England on the same principle as his ancestor Ferdinand the Catholic the expulsion of the Moors from Spain. That expulsion of the Moors was almost the

last impulse of the irreconcilable hostility which had been kindled in the heart of Christendom by the speech of Pope Urban at Clermont. The wars of the Low Countries were crusades, and finally the Spanish Armada — the last crusade — was swallowed up, we trust but we dare not vaticinate, with the crusading spirit, forever in the Ocean.

IV. A fourth result of the Crusades, if in its origin Chivalry. less completely so and more transitory and unreal, yet in its remote influence felt and actually living in the social manners of our own time, was Chivalry; or at least the religious tone which Chivalry assumed in all its acts, language, and ceremonial. The Crusades swept away, as it were, the last impediment to the wedlock of religion with the warlike propensities of the age. All the noble sentiments, which blended together are chivalry — the high sense of honor, the disdain or passion for danger, the love of adventure, compassion for the weak or the oppressed, generosity, self-sacrifice, self-devotion for others — found in the Crusades their animating principle, perpetual occasion for their amplest exercise, their perfection and consummation. How could the noble Christian knight endure the insults to his Saviour and to his God, the galling shame that the place of his Redeemer's birth and death should be trampled by the scoffer, the denier of his Divinity? Where were adventures to be sought so stirring as in the distant, gorgeous, mysterious East, the land of fabled wealth, the birthplace of wisdom, of all the religions of the world; a land only to be approached by that which was then thought a remote and perilous voyage along the Mediterranean Sea, or by land through kingdoms inhabited by unknown

nations and people of strange languages ; through Constantinople, the traditions of whose wealth and magnificence prevailed throughout the West ? For whom was the lofty mind to feel compassion, if not for the down-trodden victim of Pagan mockery and oppression, his brother-worshipper of the Cross, who for that worship was suffering cruel persecution ? To what uses could wealth be so fitly or lavishly devoted as to the rescue of Christ's Sepulchre from the Infidel ? To what more splendid martyrdom could the valiant man aspire than to death in the fields which Christ had watered with his own blood ? What sacrifice could be too great ? Not even the absolute abnegation of home, kindred, the proud castle, the host of retainers, the sumptuous fare, for the tent on the desert, the scanty subsistence it might be (though this they would disdain to contemplate), the dungeon, the bondage in remote Syria. Lastly, and above all, where would be found braver or more worthy antagonists than among the Knights of the Crescent ; the invaders, too often it could not be denied, the conquerors of the Christian world ? Hence it was that France and Spain were preëminently the crusading kingdoms of Europe, and, as it were, the birthplace of chivalry : Spain as waging her unintermitting crusade against the Saracens of Granada and Cordova, France as furnishing by far the most numerous, and it may be said, with the Normans, the most distinguished leaders of the Crusades, from Godfrey of Boulogne down to Saint Louis ; so that the name of Frank and of Christian became almost equivalent in the East.

This singular union, this absolute fusion of the religion of peace with barbarous warfare ; this elevation

of the Christian knighthood, as it were, into a secondary hierarchy (even before the establishment of the military orders), had already in some degree begun before the Crusades. The ceremonial of investing the young noble warrior in his arms may be traced back to the German forests. The Church, which interfered in every human act, would hardly stand aloof from this important rite. She might well delude herself with the fond trust that she was not transgressing her proper bounds. The Church might seem to enter into this closer if incongruous alliance with the deliberate design of enslaving war to her own beneficent purposes. She had sometimes gone further; proclaimed a Truce of God; and war, at least private war, had ceased at her bidding.¹ The clerk, the pilgrim, the merchant, husbandman, pursued his work without fear; women were all secure; all ecclesiastical property, all mills, were under special protection.

But in such an age it could but be a truce, a brief, temporary, uncertain truce. By hallowing war, the Church might seem to divert it from its wanton and iniquitous destructiveness to better purposes, unattainable by her own gentle and persuasive influences; to confine it to objects of justice, even of righteousness; at all events, to soften and humanize the usages of war, which she saw to be inevitable. If, then, before the

¹ The whole question of the *Treuga Dei* is exhausted in the work of Datt. He thus describes (quoting de Marca de lib. Eccl. Gall.) and dates the first *Treuga Dei*. *Pacem et Treugam dici hanc a bellis privatis feriationem, quod ratione clericorum omnium, peregrinorum, mercatorum, agricolarum cum bobus aratoriis, Dominarum cum sociis suis omnibus mulierum omnium, rerum ad clericos monachosque pertinentium, et molendinarum pax ista omni tempore indulta est, ratione cæterorum vero Treuga, tantum, id est induciæ aliquot dierum. Primordia hujus ad annum 1032 aut 1034 referunt. — Radulf. Glaber, v. Datt, p. 11.*

Crusades, the Church had thus aspired to lay her spell upon war ; to enlist it, if not in the actual service of religion, in that of humanity, defence of the oppressed, the widow, the orphan, the persecuted or spoliated peasantry, how much more so when war itself had become religious ! The initiation, the solemn dedication to arms, now the hereditary right, almost the indispensable duty, of all high-born men, of princes or nobles (except where they had a special vocation to the Church or the cloister), became more and more formally and distinctly a religious ceremony. The noviciate of the knight was borrowed with strange but unperceived incongruity, from that of the monk or priest. Both were soldiers of Christ under a different form, and in a different sense. It was a proud day in the Castle (as it was in the cloister when some distinguished votary took the cowl) when the young heir assumed his arms. The vassals of all orders met around their liege lord ; they paid, perhaps, on this joyous occasion alone, their willing and ungrudged fees ; they enjoyed the splendor of the spectacle ; feasted, if at lower tables, in the same hall ; witnessed the jousts or military exercises, the gayer sports, the tricks of the jongleurs, and heard the romances of the Trouveurs. But the clergy were not absent ; the early and more impressive solemnity was theirs. The novice, after bathing, bound himself by a vow of chastity (not always too rigidly observed), to shed his blood for the faith, to have the thought of death ever present to his mind. He fasted till the evening, passed the night in prayer in the church or the castle chapel. At the dawn of morn he confessed ; as the evening before he had purified his body by the bath, so now his soul by the absolution ;

he heard mass, he partook of the Holy Eucharist. He knelt before his godfather in this war-baptism. He was publicly sworn to maintain the right, to be loyal to all true knighthood, to protect the poor from oppression. He must forswear all treason, all injustice. Where woman needed his aid, he must be ever prompt and valiant; to protect her virtue was the first duty and privilege of a true knight. He must fast every Friday, give alms according to his means, keep faith with all the world, especially his brethren in arms, succor, love, honor, all loyal knights. When he had taken his oath, knights and ladies arrayed him in his armor: each piece had its symbolic meaning, its moral lesson. His godfather then struck him with a gentle blow, and laid his sword three times on his neck — “In the name of God, St. Michael (or St. George, or some other tutelar Saint), and (ever) of our Lady, we dub thee knight.” The church bells pealed out; the church rang with acclamations; the knight mounted his horse, and rode round the lists, or over the green meadows, amid the shouts of the rejoicing multitude.

But what young knight, thus dedicated, could doubt that the conquest of the Holy Land was among his primary duties, his noblest privileges? Every knight was a soldier of the Cross; every soldier of the Cross almost enlisted for this great object. There could be no doubt of the justice of his cause, nor of the enemies whom it was his duty to attack and to slaughter without remorse. The infidel, as much as the giant or dragon of romance, was the natural foe of the Christian. Every oppressed Christian (and every Christian in the Holy Land was oppressed) was the object of his sworn protection. Slaying Saracens took rank with

fastings, penitential discipline, visits to shrines, even almsgivings, as meritorious of the Divine mercy. So by the Crusades chivalry became more religious, religion more chivalrous; for it was now no unusual, no startling sight, as the knight had become in one sense part of the hierarchy, to behold bishops, priests, serving, fighting as knights. In a holy war the bishop and the abbot stood side by side with the prince or the noble; struck as lusty blows; if they conquered, disdained not the fame; if they fell, supposed that they had as good a right to the honor of martyrdom.

Even the most incongruous and discordant part of chivalry, the devotion to the female sex, took a religious tone. There was one Lady of whom, high above all and beyond all, every knight was the special servant. It has been remarked that in the French language the Saviour and his Virgin Mother are worshipped under feudal titles (*Notre Seigneur, Notre Dame*). If the adoration of the Virgin, the culminating point of chivalrous devotion to the female sex, is at times leavened with phrases too nearly allied with human passion, the general tone to the earthly mistress is purified in word, if not always in thought, by the reverence which belongs to the Queen of Heaven. This was the poetry of chivalry — the religious poetry; and in an imaginative age the poetry, if far, very far above the actual life, cannot be absolutely without influence on that life. If this ideal love, in general, existed only in the outward phrase, in the ceremonial address, in the sonnet, or in the song; if, in fact, the Christianized Platonic love of chivalry in real life too often degenerated into gross licentiousness; if the sanctity of marriage, which permitted without scruple, the homage,

the adoration of the true knight in consideration of his valor and fidelity, was not only perpetually endangered, but habitually violated, and the violation became the subject of sympathy rather than of reprobation ; yet, on the whole, the elevation, even the inharmonious religiousness of chivalry, must have wrought for the benefit of mankind. War itself became, if not less sanguinary, conducted with more mutual respect, with some restraint. Christian chivalry, in Spain and in the Holy Land, encountered Asiatic Mohammedan chivalry. For in the Arab, in most of the Oriental races, there was a native chivalry, as among the Teutonic or European Christians. If Achilles, as has been finely said, is a model of knighthood, so is the Arabian Antar. But both Achilles and Antar may meet in Richard Cœur de Lion ; though Saladin, perhaps (and Saladin described by Christian as well as Mohammedan writers), may transcend all three.¹ Hence sprang courtesy, at least an initiatory humanity in war ; hence that which proclaimed itself, which might have been expected to continue, the most bloody, remorseless, internecine strife, gradually became subject to the ordinary laws of war, in some respects to a restraint above the prevailing laws of war. Thus the most intolerant strife worked itself into something bordering on toleration. There was a contest of honor, as of arms.

If, finally, the Crusades infused into the mind of Europe a thirst for persecution long indelible ; if they furnished an authority for persecution which wasted continents, and darkened centuries with mutual hos-

¹ Compare Mr. Hallam's passage on chivalry. It were presumption now to praise that book ; but I may be permitted to say, that this is one of the very best passages in the *History of the Middle Ages*. — Boston Ed. vol. iii p. 380.

tility ; yet Chivalry, at once, as it were, the parent and the child of the Crusades, left upon European manners, especially in the high-born class, a punctilious regard for honor, a generous reverence for justice, and a hatred (perhaps a too narrow and aristocratical hatred) of injustice ; a Teutonic respect for the fair sex ; an element, in short, of true nobleness, of refinement, of gentleness, and of delicacy. The chivalrous word courtesy designates a new virtue, not ordained by our religion ; and words are not formed but out of the wants, usages, and sentiments of men ; and courtesy is not yet an obsolete term. Even gallantry, now too often sunk to a frivolous or unnatural sense, yet retains something of its old nobility, when it comprehended valor, frankness, honorable devotion to woman. The age of chivalry may be gone, but the influences of chivalry, it may be hoped, mingling with and softened by purer religion, will be the imperishable heirloom of social man.

BOOK VIII.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPES.		EMPERORS OF GERMANY.		KINGS OF HUNGARY.		ARCHBISHOPS OF MENTE.		KINGS OF FRANCE.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1009 Paschal II. 1118				1095 Koloman 1114				1060 Philip I. 1108	
		Henry IV. 1106 1106 Henry V. 1125				Notker 1103			
						1103 Ruthard 1109		1108 Louis VI. 1137	
1118 Gelasius II. 1119 1119 Calixtus II. 1124 1118 (Burdinus. Gregory VIII. antipope) 1121 1121 (Theobald. Celestine antipope) 1124 Honorius II. 1130				1114 Stephen II. 1131		1111 Albert, Chan- cellor, of Saar- bruck 1137			
1130 Innocent II. 1143 1130 Anacletus II. antipope 1138		1125 Lothair the Saxon 1137							
				1131 Bela II. 1141					
1138 Victor IV. antipope		1137 Conrad III. 1152				1137 Albert II. of Saarbruck 1141		1137 Louis VII. 1190	
1143 Celestine II. 1144 1144 Lucius II. 1145 1145 Eugenius III. 1153				1141 Geisa III. 1151		1141 Markolf 1142 1142 Henry 1163			
1153 Hadrian IV. 1159		1152 Frederick I. (Barbarossa) 1190				1153 Arnold of Seelenhoven 1160			
1159 Alex'r III. 1181 1159 (Victor IV. antipope) 1164									
1164 (Paschal III. antipope) 1163				1161 Ladislaus II. 1162 Stephen III. 1162 1163 Stephen IV. 1173		1160 Conrad of Wittlesbach 1164			
1168 (Calixtus III. antipope) 1178						1164 Christian von Bach 1183			
1181 Lucius III. 1185				1173 Bela III. 1196				1180 Philip Augustus	
1185 Urban III. 1187 1187 Gregory VIII. 1187 Clement III. 1191						1183 Conrad of Wittlesbach			
1191 Celestine III. 1198		1190 Henry VI. 1197							
				1196 Emeric					
		1197 Philip							
								ARCHBISHOPS OF REIMS.	
								1097 Manasse II. 1106	
								1107 Rodolf 1124	
								1124 Rainald II. 1133	
								1140 Samson 1161	
								1162 Henry I. 1176	
								1176 William 1202	

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

KINGS OF OF ENGLAND.		KINGS OF SPAIN.		KINGS OF DENMARK.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.		ARCHBISHOPS OF MILAN.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
		CASTILE.				1061 Alexius I. 1118			
William Rufus 1100		1072 Alfonso I. 1109		1095 Erick L. 1135				1097 Anselm IV. 1101	
1100 Henry I. 1135		1109 Urraca 1135		1105 Nicolas 1134				1102 Grossolano 1117	
		1125 Alfonso II. 1157						1112 Giordano 1120	
		Sancho III. 1158				1118 John L. 1143		1120 Ulrich 1125	
		1158 Alfonso 1214						1125 Anselm V. 1135	
		ARRAGON.							
1135 Stephen 1154		1094 Peter I. 1104		1134 Erick II. 1137				1135 Robaldo 1145	
		1104 Alfonso I. 1134		1137 Erick III. 1147					
		1134 Ramiro II. 1137				1143 Manuel 1190		1145 Oberto 1195	
1154 Henry II. 1189				1147 Sweno IV.					
		1137 Petronella and Raymond 1162		Canute V. 1156-7 1157 Waldemar 1181					
		1162 Alfonso II. 1195						1165 Galdino 1175	
		1195 Pedro II. 1213						1175 Algisi 1184	
1189 Richard I. 1190						1180 Alexius II. 1183			
		PORTUGAL.		1181 Canute VI. 1202		1183 Androni- cus I. 1185		1184 Uberto Crivelli 1187	
		1100 Henry 1112				1185 Isaac An- gelus 1195		1187 Milo de Cor- dano 1195	
		1112 Alfonso 1185				1195 Alexius III. 1204		1195 Oberto II. 1195	
ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.								1198 Philip de Com- pagnara 1206	
Anselm 1100									
(Vacant) 1114									
1114 Ralph 1122									
1122 William 1127									
1127 Corbell 1133									
1133 Theobald 1161									
1161 T. Becket 1170									
1170 Richard 1184									
1184 Baldwin 1190									
1190 Reginald 1192									
1192 Hubert		1185 Sancho I. 1212							

BOOK VIII.



CHAPTER I.

END OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV.

THE hundred years which elapsed between the death of Urban II. and the accession of Innocent III. in whom the Papal power attained its utmost height, were nearly coincident with the twelfth century. General view of the period. Of the sixteen Popes who ruled during this period, the Pontificates of two, Paschal II. and Alexander III., occupy near forty years. The reigns of Calixtus II., of Innocent II., and of Adrian IV., are distinguished each by its memorable event; the first by the settlement of the dispute concerning the investitures in the compact of Worms; the second by the coronation of Lothair the Saxon, and the intimate alliance between the Papacy and the Empire; the third by the coronation of Frederick Barbarossa and the execution of Arnold of Brescia.

It was an age of great men and of great events, preparing the world for still greater. It was the age of the Crusades, not merely the expeditions of vast undisciplined hordes, or the leagues of knights, nobles, and princes, but the regular armies of great sovereigns at the head of the powers of their kingdoms. Two Em-

perors of Germany, two Kings of France, and one of England, at different times led their forces for the recovery of the holy sepulchre. The close of the last century beheld the rise, the present will behold the fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem; the vain attempt of Philip Augustus of France and of Richard of England to restore it; the rise of the military orders, the Knights of St. John and the Templars, their organization, their long and stubborn resistance to Mohammedanism in its Asiatic territory; their retreat to take their defensive stand on the frontiers of Christendom; the final triumph of the unconquerable Saladin; after which the East settled down again under the scarcely-disturbed and iron sway of Mohammedanism. The later Crusades were diverted to other quarters, to Constantinople and to Egypt; the Emperor Frederick II. alone visited the Holy Land, and by negotiation rather than by arms obtained better terms of capitulation for the Christians.

Western Christendom, in this age, beheld in France the growing power of the monarchy; in England the first ineffectual struggles of the nation and of the king for ecclesiastical freedom; in Germany the rise of the House of Hohenstaufen, the most formidable, for a time the most successful antagonists of the Papacy; in Italy the foundation of the Lombard republics, the attempt to set up a temporal commonwealth in Rome; the still growing ascendancy of the Papacy, notwithstanding the perpetual or ever-renewed schism, and the aspirations of the Romans to share in the general establishment of republican institutions.

Nor was it only the age in which new political views began to develop themselves, and the temporal affairs

of Christendom to take a more permanent form; a great intellectual movement was now approaching. Men appeared, whose thoughts and studies began to awaken the slumbering mind of Europe. Their own or after ages have felt and recognized the power of Anselm, Abélard, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Arnold of Brescia. The religious republicanism of Arnold, the least intellectual impulse, was that which produced the most immediate but the least enduring effects: he was crushed by the uncongenial times. The strong arm of the temporal and ecclesiastical power combined to put down the rebel against both. To all outward appearance the doctrines of Arnold perished with him on his funeral pyre. They may have lurked among the more odious hidden tenets of some among the heretical sects which were persecuted so violently during the next century; kindred principles are so congenial to human nature, and so sure to be provoked into being by the inordinate wealth and ambition of the Church, that no doubt they were latent and brooding in many hearts: but Arnold founded no sect, left no writings, had no avowed followers. Those who in later times advanced similar tenets, Wycliffe, Huss, Savonarola, may never have heard of their premature ancestor. Of the other three great names, Bernard was the intellectual representative of his own age, Anselm the forerunner of that which was immediately to come, Abélard of one far more remote. Bernard has been called the last of the Fathers; Anselm was the parent of the schoolmen; Abélard the prophet of a bolder and severer philosophy, the distant harbinger of Descartes, of Locke, and of Kant. Each must find his proper place in our history.

Paschal II., another monk of Clugny, already a cardinal of the Church, succeeded Urban II. He had been bred in the school of Gregory VII., but with much of the ambition he possessed not the obstinate fortitude of his predecessors. The death of the Antipope Clement, expelled at length from Rome by Pope Paschal immediately on his accession, followed during the year after that of Urban. Guibert of Ravenna must have been a man of strong resolution, great capacity, and power of commanding respect and ardent attachment. He had not only an active and faithful party while he had hopes of attaining the ascendancy, but his adherents, many of whom no doubt could have made their peace by disloyalty to their master, clung fondly to him under the most adverse circumstances. His death did not extinguish their affections; the followers of the Antipope declared that many miracles were wrought at his tomb.

Pope
Paschal II.
A.D. 1099.
Aug. 13, 14.

A.D. 1100.
September.

Christendom might hope that the schism would expire with this rival of so many Popes. The Imperial party in Italy whose interest it might have been, if still powerful, to contest the see, was utterly depressed, and indeed so nearly extinct that it might seem the better policy to conciliate the ruling pontiff. The Emperor Henry had retired beyond the Alps, discomfited, broken in spirit by the revolt of his son, in affliction, in disgust, in despair. The affairs of Germany, as he descended the Alps, might appear no less dark and unpromising. His enemies had gained the ascendancy in almost all parts; they had established a truce throughout the Empire, which might seem to overawe any attempts on his part to resume his power, while it left them to

pursue their intrigues and strengthen their alliances at their pleasure.

The presence of Henry in his native land appeared to work a sudden revolution in his favor. Germany, with a generous sympathy, seemed disposed to console her now aged Emperor for the wrongs and afflictions which he had suffered in Italy. In a few years he found himself sufficiently powerful to establish a more perfect, it might be hoped an enduring, Peace of the Empire; and Germany assented to his just revenge against his revolted son Conrad, by assenting to his demand to devolve the inheritance of his German crown on his younger son Henry.

Strong reaction in favor of Henry.

Many circumstances conspired in favor of the Emperor. The German leagues seemed fated to fall asunder from the mutual jealousy of the princes. Duke Guelf of Bavaria had been driven into Henry's party by his indignation at the conduct of the Countess Matilda, and the fraud which he asserted she had practised on his son. She had tempted the youth to marriage by the hopes of her vast patrimony, which she had deliberately in broken faith settled on the Church. His only chance of wresting away that patrimony, to which he asserted his son's right, was by the aid of Henry. He became an ardent Imperialist.

The Crusades had not produced the same effects in Germany as in France, in Burgundy, and in other countries in Europe. They had not drained away and were not continuing to drain away to the same extent the turbulent and enterprising of the population. The more calm or sluggish German devotion had not kindled to the same violent enthusiasm. It was no less strong and profound, but was content

Effect of Crusades.

with a more peaceful and, as it were, domestic sphere. Just before the Crusades the monastic system had shown a sudden and powerful impulse to development and extension. New monasteries had been founded on a magnificent scale; knights and princes had retired into cloisters; laymen by thousands, especially in Swabia, made over their estates to these religious institutions, and even where they did not take the vows, pledged themselves to live according to the rule, to forsake their secular employments, and devote themselves to the service of monks and ecclesiastics. The daughters of free peasants formed themselves into religious sisterhoods under the direction of some respected priest, and the inhabitants of whole villages embraced at once the religious life, and vied with each other in their austerities.¹

Still the Crusades absorbed the public mind, and diverted it for a time from the internal feuds of the Empire. Germany, where not drawn away by the torrent of fanaticism, was suddenly called upon to defend itself against the lawless votaries of the cross. The crusading cause was by no means commended to respect or to emulation by the general sufferings witnessed or endured in many parts of the land from the Crusaders. The hordes of the first loose and ungoverned soldiers of the cross passed through Germany restrained by no discipline, and considering their holy cause not merely an expiation for their former sins, but a license for sinning more freely, from the assurance of full pardon in the Holy Land. The first swarm under Walter Perejo and his nephew Walter the Pennyless, with eight knights to command 15,000 men, had straggled

¹ Stenzel, page 560. Bernold, sub ann. 1091.

through the whole of Germany from Cologne, where he parted from Peter the Hermit, to the frontiers of Hungary. Then followed Peter the Hermit, whose eloquence was not without effect on the lower orders. His host gathered as it advanced through Bavaria, Swabia, Austria, till from 15,000 it had swollen to 40,000 followers, without the least attempt at array or organization. Two other armies brought up the rear, one from Lorraine and the Lower Rhine, led by the ferocious Emico, Count of Leiningen, the other under the priests Folkmar and Gotschalk, a man whose fanaticism was suspected to be subservient to baser sordid motives. The march of these formidable hosts spread terror throughout the whole land. They had begun by the massacre of the Jews in the great cities on the Rhine; their daily sustenance was by plunder, or from that compulsory provision for their necessities which was plunder in another form, and which was reluctantly doled out in order to get rid of the unwelcome guests. All this tended to quell rather than awaken the crusading enthusiasm among the Germans, who had few examples either among their princes or princely bishops to urge them into the tide. The aged Guelf of Bavaria, almost alone among the sovereign princes, the Bishops of Saltzburg, Passau, and Strasburg, among the great prelates, the two first strong anti-Imperialists, left their palaces; and as of these not one returned to his native land, their example rather repressed than excited the ardor of others.

The secret of the Emperor's quiet resumption of power lay no doubt in a great degree in the preoccupation of men's minds with this absorbing subject. His first act on his return to Germany

The Emperor
resumes his
power.

was one of generous justice and humanity — the protection of the persecuted Jews. This truly imperial conduct was not without its advantage. He exacted severe restitution of all the wealth plundered from these unhappy men ; that, however, of those who had been murdered was escheated, as without lawful owner, to the Imperial treasury. Some of the ecclesiastics had behaved with Christian humanity. The Bishops of Worms and of Spire ran some risk in saving as many as they could of this defenceless people. The Archbishop of Treves, less generous, gave them refuge in his palace on condition that they would submit to baptism. Some of the kindred of Ruthard, the Archbishop of Mentz, had joined in the general pillage ; the prelate was more than suspected of participation in the guilt and in the booty. When summoned to an account he fled from the city, and with his kindred shut himself up in the strong castle of Hardenberg in the Thuringian forest. The Emperor seized the revenues of the see, but took no steps to depose the Prelate. It was probably from this time that the Jews were taken under feudal protection by the Emperor ; they became his men, owing to him special allegiance, and with full right therefore to his protection. This privilege, in after times, they bought dearly, being constantly subject to heavy exactions, which were enforced by merciless persecutions.

The Emperor had already reinstated Guelf of Bavaria in his dukedom, and entailed the inheritance on his sons. Henry held a Diet at Mentz to Dec. 1097. settle the contested claims of Swabia. A satisfactory arrangement was made, by which the rising house of Hohenstaufen became Dukes of Northern Swabia.

For their rival, Berthold of Zahringen, a new dukedom was created, comprehending Zurich, the country between the Jura and the St. Bernard, with his patrimonial Countship of the Brisgau. Of all the great princes and prelates none were in hostility to the Emperor but the fugitive Archbishop of Mentz.

Henry seized the favorable opportunity to compass the great object which he had at heart. He urged upon the princes and bishops, in public and in private, the unnatural rebellion of his son Conrad, who had conspired against the crown, and even the life of his father. He pressed the fatal example of such treason against a sovereign and a parent. Conrad had justly forfeited his claim to the succession, which fell of right to his younger brother Henry. To Conrad there could be no attachment among the princes in Germany; if known, he could only be known as a soft and fantastic youth. He had fallen into contempt, notwithstanding his royal title, in Italy, as a mere instrument in the hands of the crafty Matilda and of the Pope. Sympathy with the injured father, and prudent considerations for the interest of the Empire, as well as the urgent solicitations of the Emperor, swayed the majority of the Jan. 6, 1099. princes. In a great Diet at Cologne, Conrad was declared to have forfeited his title. With unanimous consent the succession was adjudged to his younger brother Henry, who was anointed King at Aix-la-Chapelle. The suspicious father exacted a solemn oath from his son, that during his father's lifetime, and without his permission, he would neither claim the government of the Empire, nor even the patrimonial territories. As if oaths would bind a son who should despise the affection and authority of a father!

The death of Conrad removed all fears of July, 1101. a contention between the brothers for the Imperial Crown.

All was prosperity with Henry: his turbulent and agitated life seemed as if it would close in an august and peaceful end. By skilful concessions, by liberal grants, by courteous demeanor, he reconciled, or more firmly attached the Princes of Saxony, Bohemia, and other parts of Germany to his cause. Even religious hatred seemed to be dying away; his unrepealed excommunication was forgotten; and some of the severest ecclesiastics of the Papal party condescended to accept promotion from the hands of the interdicted Sovereign.

The Emperor proclaimed Peace throughout the land and the realm for four years;¹ he required Peace of the empire. Jan. A.D. 1103. a solemn oath from the princes to maintain this peace; he imposed heavy penalties on its violation; and (in these times a wonderful and unprecedented event!) the Emperor was obeyed. The writers of the period speak of the effects of this peace on all classes and conditions, especially on the poor and defenceless, with admiring astonishment. The ways became safe, commerce began to flourish; the cultivation of the land went happily on. What seemed most astonishing was, that boats could descend the large rivers without being stopped and plundered by the great cities on the banks, who might be in want of their corn and other commodities; that the powerful were held in check; that might for a time ceased to be right. The truce of the Empire, though proclaimed by the excommunicated Henry, was as well observed and as great a blessing as the truce of God at times proclaimed by the Pope or

¹ Land und Reich's Friede. It comprehended private and public wars

the hierarchy.¹ Still the fatal excommunication hung over the head of Henry. The golden opportunity was missed of putting an end to the schism, on the death of the Antipope Guibert, without loss of dignity; of obtaining from a Pontiff of Paschal's more pliant character less injurious terms. The miserable failure of the attempt to support a successor to Guibert ought to have urged the same policy. Three were appointed in succession: one, Theodore, fled from the city immediately that he was invested in his perilous honors. One hundred and five days after he was in the power of Paschal, condemned to be a hermit.² The second, Albert, was chosen Pope and "disposed" in the same day; dragged on a horse with his face to the tail before the Pope, who sat in state in the Lateran; he was thrust into the monastery of St. Laurence, in Aversa.³ The third, Maginolfo, who took the name of Silvester IV., had a longer Papal life. He had been raised by a strong party hostile to Paschal II., but was abandoned by all, and eventually deposed by the Emperor himself.⁴ To this more pacific course, the recognition of Paschal, the Emperor was strongly persuaded by his wiser friends: he even announced his intention of visiting Rome to effect a reconciliation of all parties by his personal presence; to submit to a General Council the whole dispute between himself and the Pope. It would have been well not to have announced this intention to which it was difficult to adhere, and which he had strong motives to

A.D. 1105.
Nov. 13.

¹ Vita Henrici, p. 386.

² Pandulph Pisan., 1. Ann. Roman., 1.

³ This was the one who, according to Muratori's expression, was disposed, dispatato. — Annal. Roman. Pandulph Pisan.

⁴ Annal. Leodicen. apud Pertz. — Annales Roman.

renounce. Henry may naturally have shrunk from venturing again on the inhospitable soil of Italy, so fatal to his glory and his peace. He may have hesitated to leave the affairs of Germany in their yet precarious state; for the peace had neither been proclaimed nor accepted by the princes. Many of the Imperialist bishops may have been alarmed lest their titles, resting on the authority of the Antipope, might be shaken by any concession to that Pope who had condemned them as usurpers of their sees.

Henry appeared not in Italy; and Paschal proceeded without delay to renew the Excommunication. This sentence is remarkable, as being Paschal ex-communicates Henry A.D. 1102. recorded by one who himself heard it delivered by the Pope. "Because the King, Henry, has never ceased to rend the vesture of Christ, that is, to lay waste the Church by plunder and conflagration; to defile it by his sensualities, his perjuries, and his homicides; and hath therefore, first by Pope Gregory of blessed memory, afterwards by the most holy Urban, my predecessor, on account of his contumacy, been excommunicated and condemned: We also, in this our Synod, by the judgment of the whole Church, deliver him up to a perpetual anathema. And this we would have known to all, especially to those beyond the Alps, that they may abstain from all fellowship in his iniquity."¹

This renewal of the excommunication had no immediate effect on the fidelity either of Henry's temporal or spiritual subjects. Many ecclesiastics of high rank and character were about his court; above all, Otho

¹ March 12. Urspergensis. See Mansi, Concil. Ann. 1102. Eccard, Chronic. ap. Pertz, vi. 224.

the Apostle of Pomerania. Otho had been compelled with difficulty to accept the bishopric of Bamberg. "The ambitious man," said the Emperor to the Ambassadors from that city, "he has already refused two bishoprics, Halberstadt and Augsburg, and would now reject the third." Otho accepted the investiture of the fief from Henry, but required the assent of the Pope to his consecration. In other respects this holy man was on the most intimate footing with the Emperor; his private chaplain, who instructed him in the Church psalmody. The Emperor even learned to sing and to compose Church music. Otho prepared for him a course of sermons for the whole year, so short as to be easily retained in the memory.

Nor did this violent measure of the Pope provoke the Emperor to hostility. At the same time that he established peace throughout the Empire, he endeavored with apparent earnestness to restore peace to the Church. He publicly announced his intention, as soon as he should be reconciled to the Pope, to make over the Empire to his son, and to undertake a Crusade to the Holy Land. Many of the more distinguished warriors of Germany were prepared to follow his footsteps.

But this most secure and splendid period in the life of Henry IV. was like one calm and brilliant hour of evening before a night of utter gloom. The greatest act of his power, the establishment of peace throughout the Empire, was fatal to that power. The proclamation of war against Mohammedanism was the triumph, the confirmation of the Pope's supremacy; the maintenance of peace the ruin of the Emperor. At the same time when the interdict seemed to sit so lightly upon him, it was working in secret, and reconciling

his most faithful followers to treason and to rebellion.

The peace — so precious and so unwonted a blessing to the lower orders, to the peasant, the arti-san, the trader, which made the roads and rivers alive with commerce — was not merely irksome, it was degrading and ruinous to the warlike nobles. The great feudatories more immediately around the court complained that the Emperor had not only deprived them of their occupation, of their glory, of their power; but that he was deluding them with a false promise of employing their eager and enterprising valor in the Holy Land. They were wasting their estates on soldiers for whom they had no use, and in idle but costly attendance on a court which dallied with their noble solicitude for active life. Throughout the Empire the princes had for thirty restless years enjoyed the proud privilege of waging war against their neighbors, of maintaining their armed followers by the plunder of their enemies, or of the peaceful commercial traveller. This source of wealth, of power, of busy occupation, was cut off. They could no longer sally from their impreg-
Unpopu-
larity of
peace.
nable castles and bring home the rich and easy booty. While the low-born vulgar were rising in opulence or independence, they were degraded to distress and ruin and famine. Their barns and cellars were no longer stocked with the plundered produce of neighboring fields or vineyards; they were obliged to dismiss or to starve their once gallant and numerous retinue.¹ He who was accustomed to ride abroad on a foaming courser was reduced to a sorry nag; he who disdained to wear any robes which were not dyed with

¹ Vita Henrici apud Pertz.

purple must now appear in coarse attire of the same dull color which it had by nature. Among the princes of the Empire it was more easy to establish than to maintain peace. The old jealousies and animosities were constantly breaking out; the Bavarian house looked with suspicion on the favor shown to that of Saxony. Lawless acts were committed, either in popular insurrection or in sudden quarrels (as in the murder of Count Sighard near Ratisbon). Dark rumors were immediately propagated of connivance, at least of indolent negligence, on the part of the Emperor. The dissatisfaction was deep, dangerous, universal. The rebellion was ripe, it wanted but a cause and a leader.

The Emperor had seen with delight the intimacy which had grown up between his son and the nobles in his court. This popularity might strengthen and secure his succession to the throne. The Prince, in all the ardor of youth, joined in their sports, their huntings, their banquets, and in less seemly diversions. The associates of a prince soon grow into a party. The older and more subtle enemies of Henry, the Papal or religious faction, saw this, too, with pleasure. They availed themselves of these younger agents to provoke and inflame his ambition. It was time, they suggested, that he should be released from the yoke of his weak and aged but severe father; that he should no longer live as a slave without any share or influence in public affairs; the succession, his lawful right, might now be his own, if he would seize it. What it might be after his father's death, what rivals might contest it, who could foresee? or even in his father's lifetime; for it depended entirely on his caprice. He had disinherited one son, he might another. The son's oath, his extorted

oath of obedience, was itself invalid; for it had been pledged to an excommunicated person; it was already annulled by the sentence of the Church.

The Emperor was without the least apprehension, or even suspicion of this conspiracy. With his son he set out at the head of an army to punish a certain Count Theodoric, who had surprised Hartwig the Archbishop Elect and the Burgrave of Magdeburg on their way to Liege, where the Prelate was to receive his investiture from the Emperor. The Papal party had chosen another Archbishop, Henry, who had been al- Revolt of Prince Henry. ready expelled from the see of Paderborn.

They had reached Fritzlar, when the Prince Henry suddenly left his father's camp, fled to Ratisbon, where he was joined by many of the younger nobles and princes, and raised the standard of revolt.

No sooner had the Emperor heard of his son's flight than he sent messengers after messengers to implore him to respect his solemn oath, to remember his duty to his father, his allegiance to his sovereign, and not to expose himself to the scorn and hatred of mankind. The son sent back a cold reply, that he could have nothing to do with one under sentence of ex- Dec. 1104. communication. In deep sorrow Henry returned to Mentz; the Archbishop of Cologne and Duke Frederick of Swabia undertook the pious office of reconciling the son and the father. The son rejected all their advances until his father should be reconciled to the Church.

No evidence implicates the Pope in the guilt of suggesting or advising this impious and unnatural rebellion. But the first act of the young Henry was to consult the Pope as to the obligation of his oath of

allegiance. The holy father, daringly ascribing this dissension between the son and his parent to the inspiration of God, sent him without reserve the apostolic blessing, and gave him absolution, on condition that he should rule with justice and be faithful to the Church, for his rebellion against his father, an absolution in the final judgment of Christ!¹

So was Germany plunged again into a furious civil war. Everywhere in the State and in the Church the old factions broke out in unmitigated ferocity. The papal clergy were the first to show their weariness of the unwelcome peace. At a meeting at Goslar the clergy of Saxony resolved to expel all the intruding and Simoniac bishops (those who had received investiture from the Emperor), if alive, from their sees, if dead, to dig up their bodies and cast them out of the churches; to reordain by Catholic hands all whom those prelates had received into orders, to interdict the exercise of any function in the Church to the married clergy.

The young Henry conducted his own affairs with consummate vigor, subtlety, perfidy, and hypocrisy. In a great assembly of bishops, abbots, monks, and clergy, as well as of the people, at Nordhausen, he appeared without the dress or ensigns of royalty, and refused to ascend the throne; but while he declared himself ready to confirm all the old laws and usages of the realm, he dared to pray with profuse tears for the conversion of his father, protested that he had not revolted against

¹ So writes an ecclesiastical chronicler. "*Apostolicus, ut audivit inter patrem et filium dissidium, sperans hoc a Deo evenire . . . de hoc commissio sibi promittens absolutionem in judicio futuro.*" — *Annal. Hildeheim.*

him with any view to the succession or with any design to depose him; that on the instant of his reconciliation with the Pope he would submit in dutiful fidelity. The simple multitude were deluded by his tears; the assembly broke out into an unanimous shout of approbation; the Kyrie Eleison was sung by priests and people with accordant earnestness.

The tragedy was hastening towards its close. In every quarter the Emperor found lukewarmness, treachery, and desertion. Prelates who had basked in his favor were suddenly convinced of their sin in communicating with an interdicted man, and withdrew from the court. The hostile armies were in presence not far from Ratisbon; the leaders were seized with an unwonted respect for human life, and with dread of the horrors of civil war. The army of the son retired, but remained unbroken, that of the father melted away and dispersed. He was obliged to take refuge in Mentz. Once before young Henry had moved towards Mentz to reinstate the expelled Archbishop Ruthard, the man accused of the plunder and even of the massacre of the Jews. Thence he had retired, being unable to cross the Rhine; now, however, he effected his passage with little difficulty, having bribed the officer commanding in Spires. Before Mentz the son coldly rejected all propositions from his father to divide the Empire, and to leave the decision of all disputes between them to the Diet. He still returned the same stern demand of an impossible preliminary to negotiation — his father's reconciliation with the Church: but as if with some lingering respect, he advised the Emperor to abandon Mentz, lest he should fall into the hands of his enemies. Henry fled to the strong castle of Hammerstein, from

thence to Cologne. The Archbishop of Cologne had already taken the stronger side; the citizens were true to the Emperor. A Diet was summoned at Mentz, at which the legate of the Pope was to be present. The Emperor hastily collected all the troops he could command on the Lower Rhine, and advanced to break up this dangerous council. The army of the younger Henry having obtained some advantage stood opposed to that of the father on the banks of the Rhine not far from Coblentz. But the son, so long as he could compass his ends by treachery, would not risk his cause on the doubtful issue of a battle. An interview took place on the banks of the Moselle. At the sight of his son the passionate fondness of the father overpowered all sense of dignity or resentment. He threw himself at the feet of young Henry; he adjured him by the welfare of his soul. "I know that my sins deserve the chastisement of God, but do not thou sully thy honor and thy name. No law of God obliges a son to be the instrument of divine vengeance against his father." The son seemed deeply moved; he bowed to the earth beside his father, entreated his forgiveness with many tears, promised obedience as a son, allegiance as a vassal, if his father would give satisfaction to the Church. He proposed that both should dismiss their armies, each with only three hundred knights repair to Mentz, to pass together the holy season of Christmas. There he solemnly swore that he would labor for lasting reconciliation. The Emperor gave orders to disband his army. In vain his more cautious and faithful followers remonstrated against this imprudence. He only summoned his son again, who lulled his suspicions by a second solemn oath for his safety. At Bingen they

passed the night together; the son showed the most profound respect, the father yielded himself up to his long-suppressed feelings of love. The night was spent in free and tender conversation with his son, not unmingled with caresses. Little thought he, writes the historian, that this was the last night in which he would enjoy the luxury of parental fondness. The following day pretexts were found for conveying the Emperor, not to Mentz, but to the strong castle of Bechelheim near Kreuznach. Henry could but remind his son of the perils and difficulties which he had undergone to secure him the succession to the Empire. A third time young Henry pledged his own head for the security of his father. Yet no sooner was he, with a few attendants, within the castle, than the gates were closed — the Emperor Henry IV. was a prisoner! His

Henry IV.
a prisoner.

jailer was a churchman, his enemy the Bishop of Gebhard of Spire, whom he had formerly expelled from his see. Either from neglect or cruelty he was scantily provided with food; he was denied a barber to shave his beard and the use of the bath. The inexorable bigot would not permit the excommunicated ministrations of a priest, still less the Holy Eucharist on the Lord's Nativity. He was compelled by menaces against his life to command the surrender of all the regalia which had been left in the castle of Hammerstein.

The Diet, attended by almost all the magnates of the Empire, assembled at Mentz; but it was not safe to bring the fallen Henry before that meeting, for there, as elsewhere, the honest popular sympathy was strong on the side of the father and of the Emperor. He was carried to the castle of Ingelheim in the Palatinate; there, stripped of every ensign of royalty, bro-

ken by indignities of all kinds, by the insolent triumph of his foes, the perfidy of his friends, the Emperor stood before a Diet composed entirely of his enemies, the worst of those enemies his son, and the Papal Legate at their head. He was urged, on peril of his life, to abdicate. "On that condition," he inquired, "will ye guarantee my life?" The Legate of the Pope replied, and demanded this further condition; he should publicly acknowledge that he had unjustly persecuted the holy Gregory, wickedly set up the Antipope Guibert, and oppressed the Church. In vain he strove for less humiliating terms, and even for delay and for a more regular judgment. His inexorable enemies offered him but this alternative or perpetual imprisonment. He then implored that, at least, if he conceded all, he might be at once released from excommunication. The Cardinal replied, that was beyond his powers; the Emperor must go to Rome to be absolved. All were touched with some compassion except the son. The Emperor surrendered everything, his castles, his treasures, his patrimony, his empire: he declared himself unworthy to reign any longer.

The Diet returned to Mentz, elected and invested Henry V. in the Empire, with the solemn warning that if he did not rule with justice and protect the Church, he must expect the fate of his father. A deputation of the most distinguished prelates from every part of Germany was sent to Rome to settle the terms of reconciliation between the Empire and the Pope.

But in the German people the natural feelings of justice and of duty, the generous sympathies with age and greatness and cruel wrong, were

People in
favor of
Henry IV.

<

not extinguished, as in the hearts of the princes by hatred and ambition, in the ecclesiastics by hatred and bigotry. In a popular insurrection at Colmar, caused partly by the misconduct of his own troops, the new Emperor was discomfited and obliged to fly A.D. 1196. with the loss of the regalia of the Empire. The old Henry received warning from some friendly hand that nothing now awaited him but perpetual imprisonment or death. He made his escape to Cologne; the citizens heard the account of his sufferings with indignant compassion, and at once embarked in his cause. He retired to Liege, where he was received with the utmost honors by the Bishop Otbert and the inhabitants of the city.

The abdicated Emperor was again at the head of a powerful party. Henry of Lorraine and other princes of the Empire, incensed at his treatment, promised to meet him in arms at Liege, and there to celebrate the feast of Easter. The young Henry, intoxicated by his success, and miscalculating the strength of feeling aroused in his father's cause, himself proclaimed a Diet at Liege to expel his father from that city, and to punish those who had presumed to receive him. He rejected with scorn his father's submissive, suppliant expostulations. So mistrustful had the old man become that he was with difficulty prevailed upon to remain and keep his Easter at Liege. His friends urged the unseemliness of his holding that great festival in some wild wood or cavern. But the enemy approached; Cologne offered no resistance: there the young Emperor observed Palm Sunday in great state. He advanced to Aix-la-Chapelle, but in an attempt to cross the Maes his troops suffered a shameful defeat. He fled back to Cologne; that city

now ventured to close its gates and drove the king and the archbishop from their walls. Henry V. retired to Bonn, and there kept his Easter, but without imperial pomp.

At Worms he passed Whitsuntide, and laid Henry of Lorraine and all his father's partisans under the ban of the Empire: he summoned all the feudatories of Germany to meet at Wurzburg in July. Once more at the head of a formidable army he marched to crush the rebellion, as it was called, of his father, and to avenge the shame of his recent defeat. But Cologne had strengthened her walls and manned them with a large garrison. The city resisted with obstinate valor. Henry V. was forced to undertake a regular siege, to blockade the town, and endeavor to reduce it by famine. His army advanced towards Aix-la-Chapelle; all negotiations failed from the mutual distrust and animosity; a battle seemed inevitable which should decide the fate of the father and the son.

But Henry IV. was now beyond either the melancholy triumph over a rebellious son or the shame of defeat, and of those consequences which might have been anticipated if he had fallen again into those ruthless hands. On the 7th of August Erlembold, the faithful chamberlain of the Emperor, arrived in the camp of Henry with the diadem and sword of his father, the last ensigns of his imperial dignity. Worn out with fatigue and sorrow, Henry IV. had closed in peace his long and agitated life, his eventful reign of near fifty years. His dying prayers to his son were for forgiveness on account of these last acts of hostility, to which he had been driven by hard extremity, and the request that

Death of
Henry.

A.D. 1056-
1106.

his earthly remains might repose with those of his ancestors in the cathedral of Spires.

No one can know whether any gentler emotions of pity, remorse, or filial love, in the tumult of rejoicing at this unexpected success, touched the heart of the son with tender remorse. The last request was inexorably refused; the Church continued its implacable warfare with the dead. The faithful Bishop of Liege, Otbert, conveyed the body of his sovereign in decent pomp to the church of St. Lambert. His nobler partisans had dispersed on all sides; but more true mourners, widows, orphans, the whole people crowded around as though they had lost a father; they wept, they kissed his bountiful hands, they embraced his cold body; they would scarcely permit it to be let down into the grave. Nor was this mere transient sorrow; they kept watch round the sepulchre, and wept and prayed for the soul of their deceased benefactor.¹

Nevertheless, haughtily regardless of this better testimony to the Christian virtues of the Emperor than all their solemn services, the bishops of the adverse party declared that he who was excommunicate in life was excommunicate in death. Otbert was compelled, as a penance for his precipitate act of gratitude and love, to disinter the body, which was placed in an unconsecrated building in an island on the Moselle. No sacred ceremonial was permitted; a single monk, just returned from Jerusalem, had the pious boldness to sing psalms beside it day and night. It was at length, by his son's permission, conveyed to Spires with a small attendance

¹ Even Dodechin writes: "Enimvero ut de eo omnia loquar, erat valde misericors." Having given an instance of his mercy, that he was "valde compatiens et misericors in eleemosynis pauperum." -- Apud Struvium, p. 677

of faithful servants. It was received by the people, and even the clergy, with great honor and conveyed to the cathedral. At this the implacable bishop was seized with indignation; he imposed penance on all who had attended the procession, he prohibited the funeral service, and ordered the body to be placed in an unconsecrated chapel within the cathedral. The better Christianity of the people again rebuked the relentlessness of the bishop. They reminded him how the munificent Emperor had enriched the church of Spires; they recounted the ornaments of gold and silver and precious stones, the silken vestments, the works of art, the golden altar-table, richly wrought, a present of the eastern Emperor Alexius, which had made their cathedral the most gorgeous and famous in Germany. They loudly expressed their grief and dissatisfaction, and were hardly restrained from tumult. But they prevailed not. Yet the bier of Henry was still visited by unbought and unfeigning witnesses to his still more Christian oblations, his boundless charities. At length after five years of obstinate contention Henry was permitted to repose in the consecrated vault with his imperial ancestors.

CHAPTER II.

HENRY V. AND POPE PASCHAL II.

IF it were ever unpresumptuous to trace the retributive justice of God in the destiny of one man, it might be acknowledged in the humiliation of Pope Paschal II. by the Emperor Henry V. The Pope, by his continual sanction, if not by direct advice, had trained the young Emperor in his inordinate ambition and his unscrupulous avidity for power. He had not rebuked his shameless perfidy or his revolting cruelty; he had absolved him from thrice-sworn oaths; he had released him from the great irrevocable obligations of nature and the divine law. A rebel against his sovereign and his father was not likely, against his own interests or passions, to be a dutiful son or subject of his mother the Church, or of his spiritual superiors. If Paschal suffered the result of his own lessons, if he was driven from his capital, exposed to personal sufferings so great and menacing as to compel him to submit to the hardest terms which the Emperor chose to dictate, he had not much right to compassion. Paschal is almost the only later Pope who was reduced to the degrading necessity of being disclaimed by the clergy, of being forced to retract his own impeccable decrees, of being taunted in his own day with heresy, and abandoned as a feeble traitor to the

rights of the Church by the dexterous and unscrupulous apologist of almost every act of the Papal See.

Hardly was Henry V. in peaceful possession of his father's throne when the dispute about the investitures was unavoidably renewed. The humble ally of the Church was not more inclined to concede the claims of the Teutonic sovereign than his contumacious and excommunicated father. The implacable enmity with which the Pope had pursued the older Emperor turned immediately against himself. Instead of an adversary weary of strife, worn out with premature old age, under the ignominy not only of his former humiliation at the feet of Hildebrand, but of his recent expulsion from Italy, and with almost the whole of Germany in open arms or leagued by discontent against him, Paschal had raised up an antagonist, a youth of unrivalled activity and unbridled ambition, flushed with the success of his rebellion, holding that authority over the princes of the Empire which sprang from their common engagement in a daring and unjustifiable cause, unencumbered with the guilt of having appointed the intrusive prelates, who held their sees without the papal sanction, yet sure of their support if he would maintain them in their dignities. The Empire had thus become far more formidable ; and unless it would humbly cede all the contested rights (at such a time and under such a king an event most improbable) far more hostile.

Pope Paschal held a synod chiefly of Lombard bishops
 at Guastalla.¹ The first act was to revenge
 the dignity of Rome against the rival see of
 Ravenna, which for a century had set up an Antipope.

Synod or
Guastalla.

¹ Labbe et Mansi, Concil. sub ann. 1106, Oct. 18.

Already, jealous no doubt of the miracles reported by his followers to be wrought at his tomb, Paschal had commanded the body of Guibert to be taken up from its sepulchre and cast into the Tiber. The metropolitan see of Ravenna was punished by depriving it of the province Æmilia, and its superiority over the bishoprics of Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, Modena, and Bologna. A prudent decree, which expressed profound sorrow for the divisions in Germany, acknowledged the titles of all those prelates who had been consecrated during the schism and had received the imperial investiture, in fact of the whole episcopacy with few exceptions, in the Empire. Those alone who were usurpers, Simoniacs, or men of criminal character, were excluded from this act of amnesty. But another decree condemned the investiture by lay hands in the strongest terms, deposed the prelates who should hereafter admit, and excommunicated the laymen who should dare to exercise, this authority. Ambassadors from the young Emperor, the Bishops of Treves and Halberstadt, courteously solicited the presence of Paschal in Germany. They proposed a council to be held at Augsburg to arrange definitively the ecclesiastical affairs of the Empire, at the same time expressing their hope that the Pope would fully concede all the rights of the Empire, an ambiguous phrase full of dangerous meaning! ¹

The Pope acceded to the request, but the Emperor and the princes of the Empire held their Christmas at Augsburg, vainly awaiting his arrival. The Pope had

¹ "Quærens, ut jus sibi regni
Concedat, sedi sanctæ cupit ipse fidelis
Esse velut matri, subici sibi vel quasi patri."

advanced as far as Verona; a tumult in that city shook his confidence in the commanding sanctity of his presence. His more prudent counsellors suggested the unconquerable determination of the Germans to maintain the right of investiture, and the danger of placing himself in the power of a prince at once so daring and perfidious.¹ He would be more safe in the friendly territory and under the less doubtful protection of the King of France. The acts of Henry might justify this mistrust. The king proceeded at once to invest the Bishops of Verdun and Halberstadt, and commanded the Archbishop of Treves to consecrate them; he reinstated the Bishop Udo, who had been deposed by the Pope, in the see of Hildesheim; he forced an abbot who was actually under an interdict in the monastery of St. Tron to violate his suspension. The papal clergy throughout Germany quailed before these vigorous measures. So utterly were they prostrated that Gebhard of Constance, Oderic of Passau, under the specious pretence of avoiding all communion with the excommunicate, had determined to engage in a foreign pilgrimage. Paschal entreats them to remain as shining lights, and not to leave Germany a land of utter darkness.²

The tone of Henry's ambassadors, before a Council held by Pope Paschal at Troyes,³ in Champagne, was as haughty and unyielding. He demanded his full privilege of electing bishops, granted, according to his assertion, by the Pope to Charlemagne.⁴ He would not

¹ *Chronicon Ursbergense*, sub ann. 1107.

² *Epist. Gebhard. Constant., &c.* "Et in medio nationis pravæ et perversæ tanquam luminaria lucere studeant." — Oct. 27, 1106.

³ May 23, 1107. The Archbishop of Mentz, Rothard, refused to be present at Troyes.

⁴ *Chronicon Ursbergense*, sub ann. 1107.

condescend to permit questions which related to the German Empire to be agitated in a foreign country, in France. At Rome this great cause should be decided; and a year's truce was mutually agreed upon, to allow the Emperor to make his appearance in that city.

It was not, however, till the third year after this truce that Henry descended into Italy. These years were occupied by wars in Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland. Though not always or eventually successful, the valor and determination of Henry, as well as his unscrupulous use of treachery when force failed, strengthened the general dread of his power and his ambition.

In a great Diet at Ratisbon on the Feast of the Epiphany, A.D., 1110, the Emperor announced his intention of proceeding to Rome — I. For ^{Diet at Ratisbon.} A.D. 1110. his coronation; the Pope had already expressed to the King's ambassadors his willingness to perform that ceremony, if Henry would declare himself a faithful son and protector of the Church. II. To reëstablish order in Italy. The Lombard Republics had now begun to assert their own freedom, and to wage furious battle against the freedom of their neighbors. Almost every city was at war with another; Milan with Lodi, Pavia with Tortona, Pisa with Lucca. III. To take measures for the protection of the Church in strict obedience to the Pope.¹ He delayed only to celebrate his betrothal with Matilda, the Infant daughter of Henry I. of England.

The summons was obeyed in every part of the Empire. Above 30,000 knights, with their attendants, and the infantry, assembled under ^{Henry's} army.

¹ "Ad nutum patris apostolici."

the Imperial banner, the most formidable army which for some centuries had descended from the Alps; and to be increased by the Italian partisans of the Emperor. Large contributions were made to defray the expenses of the expedition. In order to cope with the papal party, not in arms only, but likewise in argument, he was attended by the most learned of the Transalpine ecclesiastical scholars, ready to do theological battle in his cause.¹ Though an angry comet glared in the heavens, yet the Empire seemed to adopt with eager loyalty this invasion of Italy.

The first act of Henry struck terror into all minds.

Henry in Italy. With a considerable division of the army, the Emperor himself descended from Savoy upon Ivrea, and reached Vercelli. Novara presumed to resist. The unfortunate town was given up to the flames, its walls razed to the ground. All the other cities of Lombardy, appalled by this example, sent their plate and large contributions in money to the Emperor. The haughty and populous Milan alone refused this mark of subjection.² The other division of the army had descended by the valley of Trent; the united forces assembled in the plains of Roncaglia, near Piacenza. The proud and politic Matilda had entertained the imperial ambassadors on their return from Rome with friendly courtesy. The Emperor knew too well her importance not to attempt to gain her neutrality, if not

¹ His chaplain, David the Scot, was to be the historian of the expedition. His work is lost, but was used by the author of the *Chronicon Ursbergense*, and by William of Mahnesbury.

² "*Aurea vasa sibi, necnon argentea misit
Plurima, cum multis urbs omnis denique nummis.
Nobilis urbs solum Mediolanum populosa
Non servivit ei, nummum neque contulit æris.*" — DONIZO.

her support ; she was too prudent to offend a warlike sovereign at the head of such a force. She swore allegiance, and promised fealty against all enemies except the Pope. Henry confirmed her in all her possessions and privileges.

The army advanced, but suffered great losses both of horses and men from continued heavy rains in the passes of the Apennines. The strong fortress of Pontremoli followed the example and shared the fate of Novara. At Florence Henry held his Christmas, and compelled Pisa and Lucca to make a treaty of peace. Such an army as Henry's was not likely to be restrained by severe discipline, nor was Henry likely to enforce discipline, unless from policy. Of many cities he gained possession by delusive offers of peace. No person or property was treated with respect ; churches were destroyed : religious men seized and plundered, or expelled from their monasteries. In Arezzo Henry took the part of the clergy against the people, levelled the walls and fortifications, and destroyed great part of the city.¹

And still his march continued unresisted and unchecked towards Rome. He advanced to Aquapendente, to Sutri. There the Pope, utterly defenceless, awaited this terrible visit. He had endeavored to prevail on his vassals, the Norman princes of Calabria and Apulia, to succor him in the hour of need ; not a knight obeyed his summons.

From the ruins of Arezzo Henry had sent forward an embassy — the Chancellor Albert, Count ^{Henry ad} Godfrey of Calw, and other nobles, to nego- ^{vances on} ^{Rome.} tiate with the Pontiff. Peter, the son of Leo, a man

¹ Annalist. Saxo., sub ann. 1111.

of Jewish descent, once a partisan of the Antipope Guibert, now a firm supporter of the Pope, who had extraordinary influence over the people of Rome, was called in to assist the Cardinals in their council. The dispute seemed hopelessly irreconcilable. The Pope could not cede the right of investiture, which his predecessors and himself in every Council, at Guastalla, at Troyes, still later at Benevento, and in the Lateran,¹ had declared to be a sacrilegious usurpation. Such an Emperor, at the head of an irresistible army, was not likely to abandon a right exercised by his ancestors in the Empire since the days of Charlemagne.

To the amazement and indignation of that age, and to the wonder of posterity,² the plain principles of right and equity began to make themselves heard. If the clergy would persist in holding large temporalities, they must hold them liable to the obligations and subordinate to the authority of the State. But if they would surrender all these fiefs, royalties, privileges, and immunities, by which they were perpetually embroiled in secular concerns, and return into their purely ecclesiastical functions, all interference of the State with the consecration of bishops became a manifest invasion on the Church. The Church must content herself with its tithes and offerings; so the clergy would be relieved from those abuses inseparable from vast temporal possessions, and in Germany in general so flagrantly injurious to the sacred character. Through their vast territorial domains, bishops and abbots were

¹ At Benevento, Oct. 1008; in the Lateran, 1110, March 7. *Annalist. Saxo.* apud Pertz, vi. 748. *Annal. Hildesheim.*, *ibid.* iii. 112.

² "Anchè oggi si ha pena à credere, che un pontifice arrivassi a promettere una sì smisurata concessione." — Muratori, *Ann. d'Italia*, sub ann. 1011.

not only compelled to perpetual attendance in the civil courts, but even bound to military service, by which they could scarcely escape being partakers in rapine, sacrilege, incendiarism, and homicide. The ministers of the altar had become ministers of the court. Out of this arose the so branded monstrous claim of the right of investiture, which had been justly condemned by Gregory and by Urban. Remove the cause of the evil, the evil would cease.¹

Pope Paschal, either in his fear, and in the consciousness of his desperate and helpless position,² or from some secret conviction that this was the real interest of the Church, as well as the most Christian course; or anticipating the unconquerable resistance of the clergy, which would release him from the fulfilment of his part of the treaty, and throw the whole prelacy and clergy on his side, suddenly acquiesced in this basis for the treaty.³ The Church surrendered all the possessions and all the royalties which it had received of the Empire and of the kingdom of Italy from the days of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Henry I.; all the cities, duchies, marquisates, countships, rights of

¹ The Emperor recites the letter of Paschal. "*In vestri autem regni partibus episcopi vel abbates adeo curis secularibus occupantur, ut comitatum assidue frequentare, et militiam exercere cogantur, quæ nimirum aut vix aut nullo modo sine rapinis, sacrilegiis, incendiis, aut homicidiis exhibetur. Ministri vero altaris, ministri curiæ facti sunt, quia civitates, ducatus, marchionatus, monetas, turres, et cetera, ad regni servitium pertinentia a regibus acceperunt.*" — Dodechin apud Struvium, p. 669.

² He had already congratulated Henry, "*quod patris nequitiam abhorreret.*" Paschal had been perplexed to show what wickedness of his father, as regards the Church, Henry abhorred. Chron. Casin.

³ There is much which is contradictory in the statements. According to the writer of the Chronicon Casinense, the treaty was concluded while Henry was still at Florence by Peter Leonis on the side of the Pope, and the ambassadors of Henry.

coining money, customs, tolls,¹ advocacies, rights of Feb. 12, 1111. raising soldiers, courts and castles, held of the Empire. The King, on his part, gave up the now vain and unmeaning form of Investiture.²

The treaty was concluded in the porch of St. Peter's Church, it might seem, in the actual presence of the Apostle. The King pledged himself on the day of his coronation, in the sight of the clergy and the people, to grant the investiture of all the churches. The Pope, at the same time, was to confirm by an oath the surrender of all the royalties held by the Church. On one point alone the Pope was inflexible. Henry entreated permission to bury his father in consecrated ground. The Pope, who had already significantly reminded Henry that he had acknowledged and professed to abhor the wickedness of his father, infamous throughout the world, declared that the martyrs sternly exacted the expulsion of that guilty man from their churches; they would hold no communion in death with him who died out of communion with the Church.³

The King pressed this point no further; but he consented to swear never hereafter to intermeddle in the investiture of the churches, which clearly did not belong to the Empire, or to disturb them in the free possession of oblations or property. He was to restore and maintain to the Holy See the patrimony of St. Peter, as it had been granted by Pepin, by Charlemagne, and by Louis. He was to pledge himself neither in

1 "Advocatas regum, jura centurionum."

2 The first convention in Pertz, Leg. ii. 68. Eccard. ii. 270.

3 "Hostis enim nequitiam, toto jam sæculo diffamatam, et interior cognosceret, et gravius abhorreret. . . . Ipsos etiam Dei Martyres jam in cœlestibus positos id terribiliter exegisse sciret, ut sceleratorum cadavera de suis Basilicis pellerentur, ut quibus viventibus non communicamus, nec mortuis communicare possumus." — Chron. Casin., cap. xxxvi.

word nor thought to injure either in life or limb, or by imprisonment by himself or others, the Pope or any of his adherents, by name Peter, the son of Leo, or his sons, who were to be hostages for the Pope. All the great princes of the Empire, among them Frederick Prince of Swabia and the Chancellor Albert, were to guarantee by oath the fulfilment of the treaty. Both sides gave hostages: the Emperor his nephew Frederick of Swabia, Bruno Bishop of Spire, and three others; the Pope the sons or kindred of Peter, the son of Leo. The Pope not only consented on these terms to perform the rite of coronation, he also pledged himself never hereafter to disturb the Emperor or the Empire on these questions; to bind his successors by an anathema not to presume to break this treaty. And Peter the son of Leo pledged himself, if the Pope should fail in his part of the contract, to espouse the cause of the Emperor, and to be his faithful vassal.

Such was the solemn compact between the two great Powers of Latin Christendom. The oaths may still be read with which it was ratified by the contracting parties.¹

On Saturday, the 11th of February, Henry appeared on the Monte Mario. A deputation from the city met him, and required his oath to respect the liberties of Rome. Henry, perhaps from ignorance of the language, replied in German; a suspicion of treachery arose; the Romans withdrew in deep but silent mistrust. The hostages were exchanged on each side; Henry ratified his compact, and guaranteed to the Pope, besides the patrimony of St. Peter, that which belonged to neither, Apulia, Calabria, Sicily, and the principality of Capua.

¹ Apud Pertz. Mansi, sub ann.

The next day (Sunday) a magnificent procession of the authorities and of the people, under their different banners, escorted the King into the city. The standards of the old Republic and the new religion were mingled together. The torchbearers, the bearers of the Cross, the Eagles, the banners emblazoned with the Lion, the Wolf, and the Dragon.¹ The people strewed flowers and palm-branches; all the guilds and schools marched in their array. According to usage, at two different places the Emperor took the oath to protect and maintain the franchises of the people. The Jews before the gate of the Leonine City, the Greeks in the gate itself, the whole people as he passed through the streets, welcomed him with songs and hymns and all royal honors. He dismounted from his horse, ascended the steps of St. Peter, approached the Pope, who was encircled by the cardinals, by many bishops, by the whole clergy and choir of the Church.² He kissed first the feet, and then the mouth of the Pontiff; they embraced three times, and three times in honor of the Trinity exchanged the holy kiss on the forehead, the eyes, and the lips. All without was the smoothest and most cordial harmony, but within there was profound misgiving. Henry had demanded that the gates and towers of the Vatican should be occupied by his soldiery.

The King took the right hand of the Pope; the people rent the air with acclamations. The King made his solemn declaration to observe the

Henry
Emperor

¹ Annalista Saxo.

² The Chron. Casin. makes Henry mount his horse again, and as it should seem ride up the steps, for he dismounts again to greet the Pope. This is not unimportant, as the monk makes Henry hold the Pope's stirrup (stratoris officium exhibuit). But was the Pope on horseback?

treaty ; the Pope declared him Emperor, and again the Pope bestowed the kiss of peace. They now took their seats within the porphyry chancel.

But after all this solemn negotiation, this imposing preparation, which would trust the other ? which would first venture to make the full, the irrevocable concession ? The character of Henry justifies the darkest suspicion of his treachery, but the Pope must by this time have known that the Church would never permit him to ratify the rash and prodigal concession to which he was pledged so solemnly. All the more lofty Churchmen had heard with amazement that the successor of Hildebrand and of Urban had surrendered at once half of the dignity, more than half of the power, the independence, perhaps the wealth of the Church. The Cardinals, no doubt, as appointed by the late Popes, were mostly high Hildebrandines. Many of the Lombard bishops held rights and privileges in the cities which would have been at the least imperilled by this unlimited surrender of all royalties. But the blow was heaviest on the Transalpine prelates. The great prince bishops of Germany ceased at once to be princes ; they became but bishops. They were to yield up all their pomp, all their vast temporal power. It was the avowed design to banish them from the camp, the council, and the court, and to confine them to the cathedral. They were no longer, as holding the most magnificent imperial fiefs, to rank with the counts, and dukes, and princes ; to take the lead at the Diet ; to grant or to withhold their contingent of armed men for service under the Imperial banner ; to ride abroad with a splendid retinue ; to build not only sumptuous palaces but strong castles ; to be the

great justiciaries in their cities, to levy tolls, appoint markets and havens. Their sole occupation henceforth was to be their spiritual cure, the services in their churches, the superintendence of their dioceses: the clergy were to be their only vassals, their honor only that which they might command by their sacerdotal character, their influence that only of the chief spiritual pastor within their sees. The Pope might seem deliberately and treacherously to sacrifice all the higher ecclesiastics, to strip them remorselessly of all those accessories of outward show and temporal influence (some of the better prelates might regret the loss of that power, as disabling them from the protection of the poor against the rich, of the oppressed against the oppressor): at the same time he secured himself: to him the patrimony of St. Peter was to be confirmed in its utmost amplitude. He, and he only, was still to be independent of the tithes and oblations of the faithful; to be a sovereign, at least with all the real powers of a sovereign.

They sat, then, the Emperor and the Pope, watching each other's movements; each determined not to commit himself by some hasty word or act. The object of each was to throw upon the other the shame and obloquy of the violation of contract. Their historians have faithfully inherited their mistrust and suspicion, and cast the blame of the inevitable breach on either of the irreconcilable parties. Henry indeed is his own historian, and asserts the whole to have been a stratagem on the part of the Pope to induce him to abandon the claim to the investiture. And no doubt the advantage was so clearly on the side of the king that even some of his own seemingly most ardent adherents might dread, and might endeavor to interrupt, a

treaty which threw such immense power into his hands. Not merely was he relieved from the salutary check of the ecclesiastical feudatories, but some of the superior nobles becoming his vassals, holding directly of the Emperor instead of intermediately of the Church, were less safe from tyranny and oppression. On the other hand, it is asserted that Henry had determined never to concede the investiture — that this was one more added to his acts of perfidy and falsehood.¹

At length the king withdrew into a private chamber to consult with his nobles and his prelates : among these were three Lombard bishops, of Parma, Reggio, and Piacenza. His principal adviser was the Chancellor Albert, afterwards Archbishop of Mentz, a man of daring and ambition : of the secrets of this council nothing transpired.

Time wore away. The Transalpine prelates, to remonstrate (no doubt their remonstrance deepened into expostulation, into menace), threw themselves at the feet of the Pope. Paschal, if credit is to be given to the most full and distinct account, still held the lofty religious doctrine that all should be surrendered to Cæsar which belonged to Cæsar, that the clergy should stand altogether aloof from temporal concerns.² This doctrine, it might have been supposed, would have been most acceptable to the ears of Cæsar, who had now resumed his place. But instead of the calm ratification of the treaty, the assembly became more and more tumultuous. Loud voices clamored that the treaty could not be fulfilled.³ A partisan of Henry exclaimed,

¹ Annal. Roman., p. 474; Eccard, Chron.; Annal. Hildesheim., 1111; Pandulf. Pisan.; Chron. Casin.

² Chronic. Casin.

³ The monk of Monte Casino would persuade us that this was a cry treacherously got up by the *partisans* of Henry; probably the loudest remonstrants were Transalpines.

“What need of this dispute? Our Emperor shall receive the crown as it was received by Charlemagne, by Pepin, and by Louis!” The Pope refused to proceed to the ceremony. As it grew later he proposed to adjourn the meeting. The Imperialists, as the strife grew more hot, took measures to prevent the Pope from leaving the church until he should have performed the coronation. He and the clergy were surrounded by files of soldiers; they were scarcely allowed approach to the altar to provide the elements for the Eucharist or to celebrate the evening mass. After that mass they again sat under guard before the Confessional of St. Peter, and only at nightfall were permitted, under the same strict custody, to retire into an adjacent building. Acts of violence were committed; some of the attendant boys and even the clergy were beaten and stripped of their vestments: two bishops, John of Tusculum and Leo of Ostia, made their escape in disguise.

The populace of Rome, as soon as they heard of the imprisonment of the Pope, indignant at his treatment, or at least hating the Germans, who had already given much cause for suspicion and animosity, rose in furious insurrection. They slew all the unarmed Teutons who had come up to the city for devotion or for trade. The next day they crossed the Tiber, attacked the army without the walls, and, flushed with some success, turned upon the Emperor and his troops, which occupied St. Peter's: they almost got possession of the porch of the church. The Emperor, who had mounted his horse half armed, and charged into the fray, having transfixed five Romans with his lance, was thrown from his horse and wounded in the face. A devoted adherent, Otho, a Milanese count, gave the Emperor his

horse, but was himself taken prisoner, carried into the streets and torn limb from limb: his flesh was thrown to the dogs. The Emperor shouted to his knights in a tone of bitter reproach, "Will ye leave your Emperor to be murdered by the Romans?" The chivalrous spirit kindled at his voice; the troops rallied; the battle lasted till nightfall, when the Romans, having plundered the dead, turned back towards the city with their booty. But the Imperialists had now recovered from their surprise, charged the retreating enemy, and slaughtered a great number, who would not abandon their plunder to save their lives. The castle of St. Angelo alone, which was in the power of the Romans, checked the Germans and protected the passage of the river.

All that night the warlike Bishop of Tusculum¹ harangued the Romans, and exhorted them to rescue the Pope and the cardinals from the hands of their ungodly enemies; he lavished on all sides his offers of absolution. Henry found it prudent after three days to withdraw from the neighborhood of Rome: his Feb. 16.

army was on the wrong side of the Tiber, which lay between him and the city. He marched along the Flaminian Way towards Soracte, crossed the Tiber, and afterwards the Anio, and there joined his Italian adherents. On that side of Rome he concentrated his forces and wasted the whole territory. His prisoners, the Pope, the bishops, and the cardinals, were treated with great indignity, the Pope stripped of his robes of state, the clergy bound with ropes. The Pope, with two bishops and four cardinals, were imprisoned in the castle of Treviso; no one of his Roman adherents was

¹ The Bishop of Tusculum enhances the prowess and success of the Romans. Compare his letter to the Bishop of Alba. — Labbe, p. 775.

permitted to approach him ; the other cardinals were confined in the castle of Corcodilo.

The indefatigable Bishop of Tusculum showed the utmost energy in keeping up the resistance of the Roman people. But no help could be expected from the Normans. Duke Roger and his brother Bohemond were just dead ; the Normans could only hope to protect their own territories against the advance of the Emperor. The prince of Capua made an attempt to throw 300 men into Rome ; at Ferentino he found the Count of Tusculum posted, with other Italian partisans of Henry : his troops returned to Capua.

Two months passed away.¹ The German army wasted the whole land with merciless cruelty up to the gates of Rome. But still the resolute Paschal refused to acquiesce in the right of investiture or to crown the Emperor. Henry is said, in his wrath, to have threatened to cut off the heads of the Pope and all the cardinals. In vain the weary and now dispirited cardinals urged that he gave up only the investiture of the royalties, not of the spiritual powers ; in vain they represented the danger of a new schism which might distract the whole Church. The miseries of his Roman subjects at length touched the heart of Paschal ; with many tears he exclaimed, "I am compelled, for the deliverance of the Church and for the sake of peace, to yield what I would never have yielded to save my own life."²

¹ The rest of February and the whole of March, with some days of April.

² "Proponēbatur pontifici captivorum calamitates quod amissis liberis et uxoribus domo et patriâ exules durioribus compedibus abducebantur. Proponēbatur Ecclesiæ Romanæ desolatio, quæ pene omnes Cardinales amiserat. Proponēbatur gravissimum schismatis periculum, quod pene universæ

Near Ponte Mammolo over the Anio, this treaty was ratified. The Pope surrendered to the Emperor the right of investiture over the bishops and abbots of the Empire. He promised to take no revenge for what had passed, more especially he solemnly pledged himself not to anathematize Henry, but to crown April 11, 12. him as King, Emperor, and Patrician of Rome, and to render him all due allegiance. The king on his part covenanted to set the Pope, the cardinals, and all his other prisoners at liberty, and not to take Treaty. them again into captivity; to make peace with the Romans and all the adherents of the Pope; to maintain the Pope in the possession of his sacred dignity, to restore all the property of which he had been despoiled, and, saving the dignity of the kingdom and of the Empire, to be obedient to the Pope as other Catholic sovereigns to other Catholic Pontiffs of Rome.

The Germans suspected that into the written treaty might furtively be introduced some protest that the Pope was under force. Count Albert Blandrade declared to Paschal that his concession must be unconditional. "If I may not add a written condition," replied the Pope, "I will do it by word." He turned to the Emperor: "So will we fulfil our oath as thou givest assurance that thou wilt fulfil thine." The Emperor could not but assent. Fourteen cardinals and ecclesiastics on the part of the Pope, fourteen

Latine ecclesiæ immineret. Victus tandem miseriis filiorum, laborans gravibus suspiriis et gemitibus, et in lacrymis totus effusus ecclesiæ pro liberatione ac pace hoc pati, hoc permittere, quod pro vita mea nullatenus consentirem. — Annal. Roman. p. 475. An Imperialist writer strangely compares the conduct of Henry, in thus extorting the surrender, with Jacob's wrestling for a blessing with the angel. — Chron. Ursbergense, *in loc.* Also Annalista Saxo.

princes of the Empire on that of Henry, guaranteed by oath the fulfilment of the treaty. The written compact menaced with the anathema of the Church all who should infringe, or contumaciously persist in infringing, this Imperial privilege. No bishop was to be consecrated till he had received investiture.

The army advanced again to Rome; they crossed
April 18.
Coronation of
the Emperor. the Salarian bridge and entered the Leonine city beyond the Tiber. With closed doors, fearful of some new tumult of the people, the Pope, in the church of St. Peter, performed the office of coronation. Both parties seemed solicitous to array the treaty in the most binding solemnities. That there might appear no compulsion, the Emperor, as soon as he had been crowned, replaced the charter of his privilege in the Pope's hand, and received it a second time, contrary to all usage, from his hands. The mass closed the ceremony; the Pope brake the host: "As this part of the living body of the Lord is severed from the rest, so be he severed from the Church of Christ who shall violate this treaty."

A deputation of the Romans was then permitted to enter the church; they presented the Emperor with the golden diadem, the insignia of the Patriciate and Defensorship of the city of Rome. Yet Henry did not enter, as his predecessors were wont, the unruly city; he withdrew to his camp, having bestowed rich gifts upon the clergy and taken hostages for their fidelity: the Pope passed by the bridge over the Tiber into Rome.

The Emperor returned to Germany, having extorted in one successful campaign that which no power had been able to wring from the more stubborn Hildebrand

and Urban. So great was the terror of his name that the devout defender of the Pope and of his supremacy, the Countess Matilda, scrupled not to maintain the most friendly relations with him. She would not indeed leave her secure fortress, but the Emperor condescended to visit her at Bianello; he conversed with her in German, with which, as born in Lorraine, she was familiar, released at her request the Bishops of Parma and Reggio, called her by the endearing name of mother, and invested her in the sovereignty of the province of Liguria.

It would be unjust to Paschal not to believe him sincere in his desire to maintain this treaty, so publicly made, so solemnly ratified. But he <sup>Dissatisfac-
tion in
Rome.</sup> could no more resist the indignation of the clergy than the menaces of the Emperor. The few cardinals who had been imprisoned with him, as his accomplices, feebly defended him; all the rest with one voice called upon him immediately to annul the unholy, the sacrilegious compact; to excommunicate the Emperor who had dared to extort by violence such abandonment of her rights from the Church. The Pope, who was omnipotent and infallible to advance the authority of the Church, when he would make any concession lost at once his power and infallibility. The leader of the old Hildebrandine party, more papal than the Pope himself, was Bruno, afterwards a saint, then Bishop of Segni and abbot elect of Monte Casino. He addressed the Pope to his face: "They say that I am thine enemy; I am not thine enemy: I owe thee the love and reverence of a father. But it is written, *he who loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me.* I love thee, but I love Him more who made both me and

thee." He proceeded to denounce the treaty, to arraign the Pope for violation of the apostolic canons, for heresy. "If I do not deprive him of his Abbey," said the Pope in his bitterness, "he will deprive me of the Papacy."¹ The monks of Monte Casino, at the Pope's July 5. instigation, chose another abbot; and as the new abbot was supported by arms, Bruno gave up his claims and retired to his bishopric of Segni.

The oath which the Pope had taken, and ratified by such awful circumstances, embarrassed the Pope alone. The clergy, who had incurred no danger, and suffered no indignity or distress, taunted him with his weakness, contrasted his pliancy with the nobly obstinate resolution of Hildebrand and of Urban, and exhorted him to an act of perfidy and treason of which he would bear at least the chief guilt and shame. Paschal was sorely beset. He sought for reasons which might justify him to the world and to himself for breaking faith with the Emperor; he found none, except the refusal to surrender certain castles and strongholds in the papal territory, and some vague charges of ill-usage towards the hostages.² At one time he threatened to lay down his dignity and to retire as a hermit to the desert island of Pontia. At length the violent and incessant reproaches of the cardinals, and what might seem the general voice of the clergy, overpowered his honor, his conscience, his religion. In a letter to the Archbishop of Vienne, he declared

Embarrass-
ment of the
Pope.

¹ Chronic. Casin.

² See his letter, apud Eccard, ii. 274 and 275. "Ex quo vobiscum illam, quam nostis, pactionem fecimus, non solum longius positi, sed ipsi etiam, qui circa nos sunt, cervicem adversus nos erexerunt, et intestinis bellis viscera nostra collacerant, et multo faciem nostram rubore perfundunt." — Oct. 26, 1111.

that he had acted only from compulsion, that he had yielded up the right of investiture only to save the liberties of the Church and the city of Rome from total ruin ;¹ he declared the whole treaty null and void, condemned it utterly, and confirmed all the strong decrees of Gregory VII. and of Urban II. When this intelligence was communicated to the Emperor, his German nobles were so indignant that the legate, had he not been protected by the Emperor, would hardly have escaped with his life.

But more was necessary than this unauthoritative letter of the wavering Pope to annul this solemn treaty, to reconcile by a decree of the Church the mind of man to this signal breach of faith and disregard of the most sacred oath.

In March (the next year) a council assembled in the Lateran Palace ; almost all the cardinals, March 18, 1112. Lateran Council. whether bishops, priests, or abbots, were present, more than a hundred prelates, almost all from the south of Italy, from the north only the Venetian patriarch, from France the Archbishops of Lyons and Vienne, from Germany none.

The Pope, by a subtle subterfuge, endeavored to reconcile his personal observance with the Equivocation of the Pope. absolute abrogation of the whole treaty. He protested that, though the Emperor had not kept faith with him, he would keep faith with the Emperor ; that he would neither disquiet him on the subject of the investitures, nor utter an anathema against him,² though

¹ Card. Arragon. ap. Muratori.

² "Ego cum nunquam anathematisabo, et nunquam de investituris inquietabo, porro scriptum illud, quod magnis necessitatibus coactus, non pro vitâ meâ, non pro salute aut gloriâ meâ, sed pro solis ecclesiæ necessitatibus sine fratrum consilio aut subscriptionibus feci, super quo nulla conditione,

he declared the act of surrender compulsory, and so not obligatory: his sole unadvised act, an evil act which ought by God's will to be corrected. At the same time, with consummate art, he made his profession of faith, for his act had been tainted with the odious name of heresy; he declared his unalterable belief in the Holy Scriptures, in the statutes of the Œcumenic Councils, and, as though of equal obligation with these, in the decrees of his predecessors Gregory and Urban, decrees which asserted lay investiture to be unlawful and impious, and pronounced the layman who should confer, or the churchman who should accept such investiture, actually excommunicate. He left the Council to do that which he feared or scrupled to do. The Council proceeded to its sentence, which unequivocally cancelled and declared void, under pain of excommunication, this privilege, extorted, it was said, by the violence of Henry. The whole assembly with loud acclamations testified their assent, "Amen! Amen! So be it! So be it!"¹

But Henry was still within the pale of the Church, and Paschal refused so flagrantly to violate his oath, to which on this point he had been specifically pledged with the most binding distinctness. The more zealous churchmen determined to take upon themselves this act of holy vengeance. A council assembled at Vienne, under the Archbishop Guido, afterwards Pope Calixtus II. The Emperor condescended to send his ambassadors with letters, re-

Council of
Vienne ex-
communi-
cates the
Emperor.

nulla promissione constringimur! — pravè factum confiteor, et omnino corrigi, domino prestante, desidero." — Cardin. Arragon. *loc. cit.*

¹ "Neque vero dici debet privilegium sed pravilegium." — Labbe & Mansi, sub ann. 1112. Acta Concilii, apud Pertz.

ceived, as he asserted, from the Pope since the decree of the Lateran Council, in which the Pope professed the utmost amity, and his desire of peace. The Council were amazed, but not disturbed or arrested in their violent course. As they considered themselves sanctioned in their meeting by the Pope, they proceeded to their decree. One metropolitan Council took upon itself to excommunicate the Emperor! They declared investiture by lay hands to be a heresy; by the power of the Holy Ghost they annulled the privilege granted by the Pope, as extorted by violence. "Henry, the King of the Germans, like another Judas, has betrayed the Pope by kissing his feet, has imprisoned him with the cardinals and other prelates, and has wrung from him by force that most impious and detestable charter; him we excommunicate, anathematize, cast out of the bosom of the Church, till he give full satisfaction." These decrees were sent to the Pope, with a significant menace, which implied great mistrust in his firmness. "If you will confirm these decrees, abstain from all intercourse, and reject all presents from that cruel tyrant, we will be your faithful sons; if not, so God be propitious to us, you will compel us to renounce all subjection and obedience."¹

To this more than papal power the Pope submitted; he ratified the decree of the Council of Vi-
Oct. 20.
enne, thus doing by others what he was solemnly sworn not to do himself; allowing what was usually supposed an inferior tribunal to dispense with the oath which he dared not himself retract; by an unworthy sophistry

¹ Letter of Archbishop of Vienne, and the account of the Council, apud Labbe et Mansi, A.D. 1112.

trying to obtain the advantage without the guilt of perjury.¹

But these things were not done without strong remonstrance, and that from the clergy of France. A protest was issued, written by the learned Ivo of Chartres, and adopted by the Archbishop of Sens and his clergy, denying the temporal claim to the investitures to be heresy, and disclaiming all concurrence in these audacious proceedings.²

A good and prudent Emperor might have defied an interdict issued by less than the Pope. But the man who had attained his sovereignty by such violent and unjustifiable means was not likely to exercise it with justice and moderation. He who neither respected the authority nor even the sacred person of his father and Emperor, nor the more sacred person of the Pope, would trample under foot, if in his way, the more vulgar rights of vassals or of subjects. Henry condescended indeed to attempt a reconciliation with his father's friends, to efface the memory of his ingratitude by tardy piety. He celebrated with a mockery of splendor the funeral of his father (he had wrung at length the unwilling sanction of the Pope) in the cathedral of Spire; he bestowed munificent endowments and immunities on that church. The city of Worms was rewarded by special privileges for her long-tried attachment to the Emperor Henry IV., an attachment which, if it could be transferred, might be equally necessary to his son. For while Henry V. aspired to rule as a despot, he soon discovered that he wanted despotic power; he found that the

Discontent
and revolt
of the
German
prelates.

¹ Mansi. Bouquet, xv. 52.

² Apud Labbe et Mansi, sub ann. 1112.

habit of rebellion, which he had encouraged for his own ends, would be constantly recoiling against himself. His reign was almost one long civil war. Prince after prince, either alienated by his pride or by some violent invasion of their rights, the seizure and sequestration of their fiefs, or interference with their succession, raised the standard of revolt. Instead of reconciling the ecclesiastical princes and prelates by a temperate and generous use of the right of investiture, he betrayed, or was thought to betray, his determination to reannex as much of the ecclesiastical domains as he could to the Empire. The excommunication was at once a ready justification for the revolt of the great ecclesiastical vassals of the Empire, and a formidable weapon in their hands. From the first his acts had been held in detestation by some of the Transalpine prelates. Gerard, Archbishop of Salzburg, had openly condemned him; the holy Conrad retired into the desert, where he proclaimed his horror of such deeds. The monks of Hirschau, as their enemies the monks of Laurisheim declared, spoke of the Emperor as an excommunicated heretic. The Archbishop of Cologne almost alone defied the whole force of Henry, repelled his troops, and gradually drew into one party the great body of malecontents. Almost the whole clergy by degrees threw themselves into the papal faction. The Legates of the Pope, of their own authority it is true, and without the express sanction of the Pope, disseminated and even published the act of excommunication in many quarters. It was renewed in a synod at Beauvais, with the sanction of the metropolitan; it was formally pronounced in the church of St. Geryon at Cologne. The inhabitants of Mentz, though imperial-

ists at heart, rose in insurrection, and compelled the Emperor to release their archbishop Albert, once Henry's most faithful partisan, his counsellor throughout all the strong proceedings against Pope Paschal in Italy, but now having been raised to the German primacy by Henry's influence, his mortal enemy.¹ Albert had been thrown into prison on a charge of high treason; he was worn to a skeleton by his confinement. He became an object of profound compassion to all the enemies of Henry; his bitter and powerful mind devoted itself to revenge. Erlang, Bishop of Wurtzburg, of whose fidelity Henry thought himself secure, was sent to negotiate with the revolted princes and prelates, and fell off at once to the papal party.

While half Germany was thus at open war with the Emperor, the death of the great Countess Matilda imperiously required his presence in Italy. If the Pope obtained peaceable possession of her vast inheritance, which by formal instruments she had made over on her death to the Apostolical See, the Pontiff became a kind of king in Italy. The Emperor immediately announced his claim not only to all the Imperial fiefs, to the march of Tuscany, to Mantua and other cities, but to all the allodial and patrimonial inheritance held by the Countess;² and thus sprung up a new subject of irreconcilable strife between the Popes

Death of
Countess
Matilda.
July 24,
1115.

¹ The Pope urged his release; his only fault had been too great love for Henry. "Quantum novimus, quantum *expertum* sumus, testimonium fecimus, quia te super omnia diligebat." — Epist. Paschal, apud Eccard, ii. 276. Mansi, sub ann. 1113.

² Muratori suggests that the Emperor put forward the claim of the house of Bavaria, insisting that they were settled on Duke Guelf the younger, on his marriage. This claim was acknowledged afterwards by the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.

and Emperors. Henry expressed his determination to cross the Alps in the course of the following year.

At Rome the preparations of Henry for his second descent into Italy were heard by some with apprehension, by some with a fierce determination to encounter, or even to provoke his worst hostility in defence of the rights of the Church. Early in the spring which was to behold this descent, a Council was summoned in the Lateran. The clergy awaited in jealous impatience, the Hildebrandine party

Lateran
Council,
March 6,
1116.

mistrusting the courage of the Pope to defy the Emperor, the more moderate doubting his firmness to resist their more violent brethren. As yet the great momentous question was not proposed. There was first a preliminary one, too important, even in the present state of affairs, not to receive due attention; it related to the Archbishopric of Milan. Grosselano, a man of learning and moderation, had been elected to that metropolitan see; he had taken the cross and gone to the Holy Land. During his absence the clergy of Milan had, on some charge of simoniacal proceeding (he may not have been so austere as they might wish to the old unextinguished faction of the married clergy), or, as it is alleged, because he had been uncanonically translated from the see of Savona, declared him to have forfeited his see. They proceeded to elect A.D. 1112.

Giordano, represented, by no friendly writer, as a man without education (perhaps of the monastic school) and of no great weight. Giordano had been consecrated by three suffragans: Landolf Bishop of Asti, who attempted to fly, but was brought back and compelled to perform the office; Arialdo Bishop of Genoa; and Mamardo Bishop of Turin. Mamardo hastened to

Rome to demand the metropolitan pall for Giordano. The Archiepiscopate of Milan was of too great dignity and influence not to be secured at any cost for the high party. The Pope abandoned unheard the cause of Grossolano, and sent the pall to Giordano, but he was not to be arrayed in it till he had sworn fidelity to the Pope, and sworn to refuse investiture from the Emperor. For six months Giordano steadfastly declined to receive the pall on these terms. A large part of the people of Milan were still in favor of Grossolano, and seemed determined to proceed to extremities in his favor. The Bishops Azzo of Acqui, and Arderic of Lodi, strong Imperialists, took up the cause of Grossolano. Already was Giordano's determination shaken; when Grossolano, on his return from the Holy Land, having found his see occupied, nevertheless entered Milan. His partisans seized the towers of the Roman Gate; Giordano at once submitted to the Papal terms; and, arrayed in the pall, proclaimed himself Archbishop on the authority of the Pope. After some strife, and not without bloodshed of the people, and even of the nobles, Grossolano was driven from Milan; he was glad to accept of terms of peace, and even pecuniary aid (the exhaustion of his funds may account for his discomfiture), from his rival; he retired first to Piacenza, afterwards to Rome, to submit to the decision of the Pope.¹

But this great cause was first mooted in the Council of Lateran. There could be no doubt for which Archbishop of Milan — one who had sworn not to accept investiture from the Emperor, or one at least suspected of Imperialist views — it would declare.

¹ Eccard, *Chronic. Landulf junior*, apud Muratori S. H. T. V. sub ann.

Giordano triumphed; and, whether as part of the price stipulated for the judgment, or in gratitude and bold zeal for the cause which he had espoused, he returned rapidly to Milan. Henry was on the crest of the Alps above him; yet Giordano dared, with the Roman Cardinal John of Cremona, to publish from the pulpit of the principal church, the excommunication of the Emperor. Even this affair of Milan, important as it was, had hardly commanded the attention of the Lateran Council. But when, after this had been despatched, some other questions were proposed concerning certain disputes between the Bishops of Pisa and Lucca, they would no longer brook delay, a Bishop sprang up and exclaimed, "What have we to do with these temporal matters, when the highest interests of the Church are in peril?"¹ The Pope arose; he reverted, in few words, to his imprisonment, and to the crimes and cruelties to which the Roman people had been exposed at the time of his concession. "What I did, I did to deliver the Church and people of God from those evils. I did it as a man who am dust and ashes. I confess that I did wrong: I entreat you, offer your prayers to God to pardon me. That writing signed in the camp of the King, justly called an unrighteous decree, I condemn with a perpetual anathema. Be its memory accursed forever!"² The Council shouted their acclamation. The loudest voice was that of Bruno, the Bishop of Segni—"Give thanks to God that our Lord Pope Paschal condemns with his own March 8. mouth his unrighteous and heretical decree." In his

¹ It was rumored in Germany that the Council had determined to depose Paschal, if he refused to revoke the Emperor's charter of investiture.

² Ursbergensis, and Labbe and Mansi sub ann.

bitter triumph he added, "He that uttered heresy is a heretic." "What!" exclaimed John of Gaeta, "dost thou presume in our presence to call the Roman Pontiff a heretic? What he did was wrong, but it was no heresy." "It was done," said another Bishop, "to deliver the people." The Pope interposed with calm dignity: he commanded silence by his gesture. "Give ear, my brethren; this Church has never yielded to heresy. It has crushed all heresies — Arian, Eutychian, Sabellian, Photinian. For our Lord himself said, in the hour of his Passion, I have prayed for thee, O Peter, that thy faith fail not."

But the strife was not over. On the following day, Paschal afraid of his own act. Paschal, with his more moderate counsellors, John of Gaeta and Peter the son of Leo, began to enter into negotiations with the Ambassador of Henry, Pontius Abbot of Clugny. The majesty of the Papal presence could not subdue the indignant murmurs of the more Papal party, who insisted on the Church holding all its endowments, whether fiefs of the temporal power or not, absolutely and without control.

Conon, Cardinal of Præneste. At length Conon, Cardinal of Præneste, broke out, and demanded whether the Pope acknowledged him to have been his legate in Germany, and would ratify all that he had done as legate. The Pope acknowledged him in these terms: "What you have approved, I have approved; what you have condemned, I have condemned." Conon then declared that he had first in Jerusalem, and afterwards five times, in five councils, in Greece, in Hungary, in Saxony, in Lorraine, in France, excommunicated the Emperor. The same, as appeared from his letters, had been done by the Archbishop at Vienne. That excommunication

was now therefore confirmed by the Pope, and became his act. A feeble murmur of dissent soon died away; the Pope kept silence.

But Paschal's troubles increased. If the Emperor should again appear before Rome, in indignation at the broken treaty, and, by temperament and habit, little disposed to be scrupulous in his measures against an enemy whom treaties could not bind, his only hope of resistance was in the attachment of the Roman people. That attachment was weakened at this unlucky moment by unforeseen circumstances. The Prefect of Rome died, and Paschal was persuaded to appoint the son of Peter Leonis to that office. The indelible taint of his Jewish descent, and his Jewish wealth, made Peter an object of envy and unpopularity. The vulgar called him a Jew, an usurer — equivalent titles of hatred. The people chose the son of the late Prefect, a boy, and presented him to the Pope for his confirmation. On the Pope's refusal, tumults broke out in all the city; skirmishes took place between the populace and the soldiers of the Pope during the Holy Week. The young Prefect was taken in the country by the Pope's soldiers, and rescued by his uncle, the Count Ptolemy. The contest thus spread into the country. The whole territory of Rome, the coast, Rome itself, was in open rebellion. The Pope was so alarmed that he retired to Sezza. The populace revenged themselves on the houses of Peter Leonis and those of his adherents.

The Emperor had passed the Alps; he was received in Venice by the Doge Ordelaaffo Faliero with March 29. royal magnificence. Some of the other great cities of Lombardy followed the example. The Emperor had

Henry in
Italy.
April 3. taken peaceable possession of the territories of the Countess Matilda: neither then, nor during his lifetime, did the Pope or his successors contest his title. Italy could not but await with anxious apprehension the crisis of this second, perhaps personal strife between the Emperor and the Pope. But the year passed away without any attack on Rome. The Emperor was engaged in the affairs of Tuscany; the Pope by the rebellion of Rome. Early in the following year terrible convulsions of nature seemed to portend dire calamities. Earthquakes shook Venice, Verona, Parma, and Cremona; the Cathedral of Cremona, with many churches and stately buildings, were in ruins, and many lives lost. Awful storms seemed to join with civil commotions to distract and desolate Germany.

The Ambassadors of Henry, the Bishops of Asti, Piacenza, and Acqui, appeared at Rome, to which Paschal had returned after the cessation of the civil commotions, with a public declaration, that if any one should accuse the Emperor of having violated his part of the treaty with the Pope, he was ready to justify himself, and if guilty, to give satisfaction. He demanded the abrogation of the interdict. The Pope, it is said, with the concurrence of the Cardinals, declared that he had not sent the Cardinals Conon and Theodoric to Cologne or to Saxony; that he had given no authority to the Archbishop of Vienne to excommunicate the Emperor; that he had himself pronounced no excommunication; but he could not annul an excommunication pronounced by such dignified ecclesiastics without their consent. A general Council of the Church could alone decide the question. Henry had

too many enemies in the Church of Germany as well as Rome to submit to such a tribunal.

A second time Henry V. advanced towards Rome, but this second time under very different cir- A.D. 1117.
cumstances. He was no longer the young and successful Emperor with the whole of Germany united in his cause, and with an army of overwhelming numbers and force at his command. But with his circumstances he had learned to change his policy. He had discovered how to contest Rome with the Pope. He had the Prefect in his pay; he lavished gifts upon the nobles; he established his partisan Ptolemy, the Count of Tusculum, in all the old possessions and rights of that house, so long the tyrant, at one time the awarder, of the Papal tiara, gave him his natural daughter in marriage, and so established a formidable enemy to the Pope and a powerful adherent of the Emperor, within the neighborhood, within the city itself. There was no opposition to his approach, to his entrance into Rome. He passed through the streets with his Empress, the people received him with acclamations, the clergy alone stood aloof in jealous silence. The Pope had retired, first to Monte Casino, then to March 16.

Benevento, to implore, but in vain, the aid of the Normans. The Cardinals made an offer of peace if Henry would surrender the right of investiture by the ring and staff; but as on this point the whole imperial authority seemed at that time to depend, the terms were rejected. No one but a foreign prelate,¹ Burdinus, the Archbishop of Braga,² who had been Legate of Pope

¹ The Abbot of Farfa was a strong Imperialist.

² Baluzius (*Miscellanea*, vol. iii.) wrote a life of Burdinus, to vindicate his memory from the sweeping censure of Baronius, with whom an Anti

Paschal to Henry, and had been dazzled or won to the Imperial party, could be tempted to officiate in the great Easter ceremony, in which the Emperor was accustomed to take off his crown in the Vatican, to make a procession through the city, and to receive it again from the hands of the Pontiff.¹

But no steps were taken to approximate the hostile powers. The Emperor remained in undisturbed possession of Rome; the Pope in his safe city of refuge in the south of Italy; from hence he fulminated an excommunication against the Archbishop of Braga. As the summer heats approached, the Emperor retired to the north of Italy.

Paschal was never again master of Rome. In the Jan. 6, 1118. autumn he fell ill at Anagni, recovered, and Death of early in the following year surprised the Le- Paschal II. onine city and the Vatican. But Peter the Prefect and the Count of Tusculum still occupied the strong-

pope was always a monster of iniquity. Maurice Bourdin was a Frenchman of the diocese of Limoges. When Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo, went to the Council of Clermont, he was struck with the learning and ability of the young French monk, and carried him back with him to Spain. Bourdin became successively Bishop of Coimbra and Archbishop of Braga. While Bishop of Coimbra he went to the Holy Land, and passed three years in the East, in Jerusalem and Constantinople. On his return he was involved in a contest with his patron Bernard, resisting the claims of the archbishopric of Toledo to supremacy over the metropolitan see of Braga. There is a decree of Pope Paschal favorable to Maurice, acknowledging his jurisdiction over Coimbra. He was at present in Rome. in order, according to Baronius, to supplant his patron Bernard, who had been expelled from his see by Alfonso of Arragon. He was scornfully rejected by Paschal, of whom he became the deadly enemy. This, as Baluzius repeatedly shows, is directly contradicted by the dates; for after this Paschal employed Maurice Burdin as his Legate to the Emperor.

¹ Henry had been already crowned by Paschal: this second coronation is probably to be explained as in the text; though some writers speak of it as his first coronation. Muratori says that he desired "*di farsi coronare di nuovo.*" — Sub ann. 1017.

holds of the city. Paschal died in the Castle of St. Angelo, solemnly commending to the cardinals that firmness in the assertion of the claims of the Church which he alone had not displayed. He died leaving a great lesson to future Pontiffs, that there was no limit to which they might not advance their pretensions for the aggrandizement of the hierarchy, but to retract the least of these pretensions was beyond their otherwise illimitable power. The Imperialists made no opposition to the burial of Paschal II. in a great mausoleum in the Lateran Church. The Cardinals, in the utmost haste, before the intelligence could reach the Emperor, proceeded to fill the vacant See. John of Gaeta, though he had defended the Pope from the unseemly reproach of St. Bruno, and at one time appeared inclined to negotiate with the Emperor, seems to have commanded the confidence of the high party; he was of noble descent; the counsellor of more than one Pope, and had been a faithful partisan of Pope Urban against the Antipope Guibert; he had adhered in all his distresses to Paschal, and had shared his imprisonment. He was summoned from Monte Cassino secretly, and without any notice chosen Pope by the Cardinals and some distinguished Romans, and inaugurated in a Benedictine monastery near the Capitol.

The news reached the neighboring house of Cencius Frangipani (this great family henceforward appears mingled in all the contests and intrigues of Rome), a strong partisan of the Emperor. In a sudden access of indignation he broke with his armed fol-
lowers into the church, seized the Pope by the
throat, struck him with his fists, trampled

Seized by
the Frangi-
pani.
Jan. 24.

upon him, and dragged him a prisoner and in chains to his own strong house. All the Cardinals were miserably maltreated; the more fortunate took to flight; some were seized and put into irons. But this atrocious act rekindled all the more generous sympathies of the Roman people towards the Pope. Both parties united in his rescue. Peter the Prefect and Peter the son of Leo, the captain of the Norman troops, who had accompanied Paschal to Rome, the Transteverines, and the twelve quarters of the city, assembled under their leaders; they marched towards the Capitol and summoned Frangipani to surrender the person of the Pope. Frangipani could not but submit; he threw himself at the Pope's feet, and entreated his forgiveness. Mounting a horse, the Pope rode to the Lateran, surrounded by the banners of the people, and took possession of the papal palace. There he received the submission of the laity and of the clergy. The friends of the new Pope were quietly making arrangements for his ordination as a presbyter (as yet he was but a deacon), and his consecration as Pope. On a sudden, in the night, intelligence arrived that the Emperor had not merely set off from the north of Italy, but was actually in Rome, and master of the portico of St. Peter's. The Pope was concealed for the night in the house of a faithful partisan. In the morning he embarked on the
March 1. Tiber, but a terrible storm came on; the German soldiers watched the banks of the river, and hurled burning javelins at the vessel. At nightfall, the Germans having withdrawn, the fugitives landed, and the Pope was carried on the shoulders of Cardinal Ugo to the castle of Ardea. The next day the German soldiers appeared again, but the followers of the

Pope swearing that he had escaped, they dispersed in search of him. He was again conveyed to the vessel, and after a perilous voyage of four days, March 9. reached Gaeta, his native town. There he was ordained Presbyter, and consecrated Pope.

Henry endeavored by repeated embassies to persuade Gelasius II., such was the name assumed by the new Pope, to return to Rome; but Gelasius had been a fellow-prisoner with Pope Paschal, and had too much prudence to trust himself in the Emperor's power.¹ He met cunning with cunning; he offered to hold a council to decide on all matters in dispute, either in Milan or in Cremona, cities in which the papal interest now prevailed, or which were in open revolt against the Emperor. This proposal was equally offensive to the Emperor and to the Roman people. "What," was the indignant cry, "is Rome to be deserted for Milan or Cremona?" They determined to set up an Antipope; yet none appeared but Burdinus, now called Maurice the Portuguese, the Archbishop of Braga.² This stranger was led to the high altar of St. Peter's by the Emperor; and it was thrice proclaimed March 8. to the people, "Will ye have Maurice for Pope?" and thrice the people answered, "We will." The Barbarian, as he was called by his adversaries, took the name of Gregory VIII. Of the Roman clergy only three adherents of the old unextinguished Ghibeline party, Romanus Cardinal of St. Marcellus, Cencius of St. Chrysogonus, and Teuzo, who had been long in

¹ Epist. Gelas. II. apud Labbe, Concil. Ann. 1118.

² The famous Irnerius of Bologna, the restorer of the Roman law, was in Rome; the form of election was supposed to be regulated by his legal advice.

Denmark, sanctioned this election. He was put in possession of the Lateran palace, and the next day performed the papal functions in St. Peter's.

No sooner did Gelasius hear this than he thundered his sentence of excommunication against the perjurer Maurice, who had compelled his mother the Church to public prostitution.¹ Now, however, his Norman vassals, as they acknowledged themselves, William, Duke of Apulia, and Robert, Prince of Capua, obeyed his summons; under their protection he returned towards Rome. Henry, who was besieging the papal castle Toricella, abandoned the siege, and retired on Rome. But almost immediately his presence was imperiously required in Germany, and he withdrew to the north of Italy. Thence, leaving the Empress as Regent in April 7. Italy, he crossed the Alps. Gelasius had already at Capua involved the Emperor in the common excommunication with the Antipope. Some misunderstanding arose between the Norman princes and the Pope;² they withdrew, and he could now only bribe his way back to Rome.

Gelasius entered Rome as a pilgrim rather than its master. He was concealed rather than hospitably entertained by Stephen the Norman, by Paschal his brother, and Peter with the ill-sounding name of the Robber, a Corsican.³ Thus were there again two Popes in the city, one maintained in state by the gold of the Emperor, the other by his own. But Gelasius in an imprudent hour ventured beyond the

¹ "Matris Ecclesiæ constupratorem publico." — Gelasii, Epist. ii.

² It seemed to relate to the Circaea arx, which the Pope having granted to the people of Terracina, repented of his rashness. — Vit. Gelas.

³ Latro Corsorum.

secure quarters of the Norman. He stole out to celebrate mass in the church of St. Praxedes, in a part of the city commanded by the Frangipani. The church was attacked; a scene of fearful confusion followed; the Normans, under the Pope's nephew Crescentius, fought valiantly, and rescued him from the enemy. The Frangipani were furious at their disappointment, but when they found the Pope had escaped, withdrew. "O what a sight," writes a sad eye-witness,¹ "to see the Pope, half clad in his sacred vestments, flying, like a mountebank,² as fast as his horse could gallop!" — his cross-bearer followed; he fell; the cross, which it might seem that his enemies sought as a trophy, was picked up and concealed by a woman. The Pope himself was found, weary, sorrowful, and moaning³ with grief, in a field near the Church of St. Paul. The next day he declared his resolution to leave this Sodom, this Egypt; it were better to have to deal with one Emperor than with many tyrants. He reached Pisa, Genoa, Marseilles; but he entered France Jan. 29, 1119. only to die. After visiting several of the Death of Gelasius. great cities of the realm, Montpellier, Avignon, Orange, Valence, Vienne, Lyons, a sudden attack of pleurisy carried him off in the abbey of Clugny.

¹ See the letter of Bruno of Treves, in Hontheim, *Hist. Trevir. Pandulph Pisan.*, p. 397.

² *Sicut scurra.*

³ His follower says, "*ejulans.*"

CHAPTER III.

CALIXTUS II.—CONCORDAT OF WORMS.

THE cardinals in France could not hesitate an instant in their choice of his successor. Calixtus II.
Feb. 2 1119. Gelasius had turned his thoughts to the Bishop of Palestrina, but Otho excused himself on account of his feeble health. Exiles from Rome in the cause of the Church, and through the hostility of the Emperor and his partisans, the Conclave saw among them the prelate who had boldly taken the lead in the excommunication of Henry; and who to his zeal for the Church added every other qualification for the supreme Pontificate. Guido, Archbishop of Vienne, was of more than noble, of royal birth, descended from the Kings of Burgundy, and so allied by blood to the Emperor; his reputation was high for piety and the learning of the age. But Guido, either from conscientious scruples, or in politic deference to the dominant opinion, refused to become the Pontiff of Rome without the assent of Rome. Messengers were speedily despatched and speedily returned with the confirmation of his election by the cardinals who remained at Rome, by Peter the son of Leo, by the prefect and consuls, by the clergy and people of Rome. It appears not how this assent was obtained in the presence of the Imperial garrison and the Antipope. Rome may have already become weary

or ashamed of her foreign prelate, unconnected with the great families or interests of the city; but it is more probable that it was the assent only of the high papal party, who still, under the guidance of Peter the son of Leo, held part of the city.

Germany had furnished a line of pious, and, on the whole, high-minded Pontiffs to the Roman ^{Calixtus} see. Calixtus II., though by no means the ^{a French} Pope, first Frenchman, either by birth or education, was the first French Pontiff who established that close connection between France (the modern kingdom of France as distinguished from the Imperial or German France of Pepin and Charlemagne) and the papacy, which had such important influence on the affairs of the Church and of Europe. From this period, of the two great kingdoms into which the Empire of Charlemagne had resolved itself, the Pope, who succeeded eventually in establishing his title, was usually connected with France, and maintained by the French interest; the Antipope by that of Germany. The anti-Imperialist republics of Italy were the Pope's natural allies against the Imperial power. For a time Innocent III. held his impartial authority over both realms, and acknowledged in turn the king of each country; but as time advanced, the Popes were more under the necessity of leaning on Transalpine aid, until the secession to Avignon almost reduced the chief Pontiff of Christendom to a French prelate.

Christendom could scarcely expect that during the pontificate of so inflexible an assertor of its claims, and during the reign of an Emperor so resolute to maintain his rights, the strife about the Investitures should be brought to a peaceful close with the absolute triumph

of neither party, and on principles of mutual concession. Nor was the first attempt at reconciliation, which appeared to end in a more irreparable breach, of favorable augury to the establishment of unity. Yet many circumstances combined to bring about this final peace. The removal of the scene of strife into France could not but show that the contest was not absolutely necessary. The quarrel had not spread into France, though the feudal system prevailed there to the same if not greater extent. In France had been found no great difficulty in reconciling the free election of the bishops with their allegiance in temporal concerns to their sovereign. The princes of Germany began to discover that it was a question of the Empire, not of the Emperor. When in revolt, and some of them were always in revolt, the alliance of the clergy, and the popularity which their cause acquired by being upheld against an excommunicated sovereign, had blinded them at first. They were firm allies of the Pope, only because they were implacable enemies of the Emperor. The long controversy had partly wearied, partly exhausted men's minds. Some moderate views by prelates of authority and learning and of undoubted churchmanship had made strong impression. Hildebrand's vast plan of rendering the clergy altogether independent of the temporal power, not merely in their spiritual functions, but in all the possessions which they then held or might hereafter obtain, and thereby becoming the rulers of the world, was perhaps imperfectly understood by some of the most ambitious, and deliberately rejected by some zealous but less worldly ecclesiastics.

At first the aspect of affairs was singularly unpromising; the contending parties seemed to draw together

only to repel each other with more hostile violence. The immediate recognition of Calixtus by the great German prelates, not his enemies alone but his adherents also, warned Henry of the now formidable antagonist arisen in the new Pope. Henry himself, by treating with Calixtus, acknowledged his supremacy, and so abandoned his own unhappy pageant, the Archbishop of Braga, to his fate.

Calixtus summoned a council at Rheims, and never did Pope, in Rome itself, in the time of the world's most prostrate submission, make a more imposing display of power, issue his commands with more undoubting confidence to Christendom, receive, like a feudal monarch, the appeals of contending kings ; and, if he condescended to negotiate with the Emperor, maintain a loftier position than this first great French Pontiff. The Norman chronicler beheld in this august assembly an image of the day of judgment.¹ The Pope's consistorial throne was placed before the portal of the great church ; just below him sat the cardinals, whom the annalist dignifies with the appellation of the Roman Senate. Fifteen archbishops, above two hundred bishops, and numerous abbots and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, were present ; Albert of Mentz was attended by seven bishops, and guarded by five hundred armed men.

The first part of the proceedings might seem singularly in accordance with true pacific Christianity. After some canons on simony, some touching lay investitures and the marriage of the clergy, had been enacted in the usual form and spirit, the Pope renewed in the strongest language the Truce of God, which had been pro-

¹ Orderic. Vital., i. 726 ; Mansi, sub ann.

claimed by Urban II. At certain periods, from the Advent of the Lord to the Octave of the Epiphany; from Quinquagesima to Pentecost, and on certain other fasts and festivals, war was to cease throughout Christendom. At all times the Church took under its protection and commanded peace to be observed towards monks and their property, females and their attendants, merchants, *hunters*, and pilgrims. The chaplains in the army were to discountenance plunder under severe penalties. The violators of the Truce of God were to be excommunicated every Sunday in every parish church: unless they made satisfaction, by themselves or by their kindred, were to be held unworthy of Christian burial.¹

The King of France, Louis the Fat, appeared in person with his barons, and, as before a supreme Kings of France and England. tribunal, himself preferred his complaint against Henry I. King of England. His complaint related to no ecclesiastical matters; he accused King Henry of refusing the allegiance due from the Duke of Normandy to the King of France, of imprisoning his own brother Robert, the rightful Duke of Normandy, of many acts of hostility and persecution against the subjects of France. Geoffrey, Archbishop of Rouen, rose to defend King Henry. But the fierce tumult which broke out from the more numerous partisans of France compelled him to silence.

After the Countess of Poitou had brought a charge against her husband of deserting her and marrying another wife, there arose a new dispute between the Franks and Normans concerning the bishopric of Ev-

¹ Labbe, p. 684. Datt. de Treugâ Dei in Volum. Rer. German. Ulm, 1698. Ducange in voce "*Treuga*."

reux. Audoin, the bearded bishop of Evreux, accused Amalric of expelling him from his see, and burning his episcopal palace. The chaplain of Amalric stood up and boldly replied, "It is thine own wickedness, not the injustice of Amalric, which has driven thee from thy see and burned thy palace. Amalric, disinherited by the King through thy malignant perfidy, like a true Norman warrior, strong in his own valor and in his friends, won back his honors. Then the King besieged the city, and during the siege the bishop's palace and several of the churches were burned. Let the synod judge between Audoin and Amalric."

The strife between the French and the Normans was hardly appeased by the Pope himself. Calixtus delivered a long address on the blessings of peace, on the evils of war, war alike fatal to human happiness and to religion. But these beautiful and parental sentiments were jealously reserved for the faithful sons of the Church. Where the interests of the Church were involved, war, even civil war, lost all its horrors. The Pope broke off the council for a few days, to meet the Emperor, who had expressed his earnest desire for peace, and had apparently conceded the great point in dispute. It was no doubt thought a great act of condescension as well as of courage in the

Interview
with the
Emperor.

Pope to advance to meet the Emperor. The character of Henry might justify the worst suspicions. He was found encamped at the head of 30,000 men. The seizure and imprisonment of Paschal was too recent in the remembrance of the Pope's adherents not to excite a reasonable apprehension. Henry had never hesitated at any act of treachery to compass his ends; would he hesitate even on the borders of France? The Pope was

Oct. 23, 25. safely lodged in the strong castle of Moisson ; his commissioners proceeded alone to the conference.

Their mission was only to give and to receive the final ratification of a treaty, already consigned to writing. Henry had been persuaded, in an interview with the Bishop of Châlons and Abbot Pontius of Clugny, that he might surrender the investiture with the ring and the pastoral staff. That form of investiture (argued the Bishop of Châlons) had never prevailed in France, yet as Bishop he had always discharged all the temporal claims of the sovereign, tribute, military service, tolls, and the other rightful demands of the State, as faithfully as the bishops of Germany, to whose investiture the Emperor was maintaining this right at the price of excommunication. "If this be so," replied the Emperor, with uplifted hands, "I require no more." The Bishop then offered his mediation on the condition that Henry should give up the usage of investitures, surrender the possession of the churches which he still retained, and consent to peace with all his enemies. Henry agreed to these terms, which were signed on the part of the Emperor by the Bishop of Lausanne, the Count Palatine, and other German magnates. The Pope on this intelligence could not but suspect the ready compliance of the Emperor ; the Bishop of Ostia and the Cardinal Gregory were sent formally to conclude the treaty. They met the Emperor between Metz and Verdun, and drew up the following Concordat : — Henry surrendered the investiture of all churches, made peace with all who had been involved in war for the cause of the Church, promised to restore all the churches which he had in his possession, and to procure the restoration of those which had been granted

to others. All ecclesiastical disputes were to be settled by the ecclesiastical laws, the temporal by the temporal judges. The Pope on his side pledged himself to make peace with the Emperor and with all his partisans; to make restitution on his part of everything gained in the war. These terms by the Pope's orders had been communicated to the Council, first in Latin by the Bishop of Ostia, afterwards explained to the clergy and laity in French by the Bishop of Châlons. It was to ratify this solemn treaty that the Pope had ^{Treaty} set forth from Rheims; while he remained in ^{broken} ^{Oct.} the castle of Moisson, the Bishop of Ostia, John Cardinal of Crema, the Bishop of Vivarais, the Bishop of Châlons, and the Abbot of Clugny, began to scrutinize with more severe suspicion the terms of the treaty. They discovered, or thought they discovered, a fraud in the general concession of the investiture of all churches; it did not express the whole possessions of the churches. The Emperor was indignant at this new objection, and strong mutual recrimination passed between him and the Bishop of Châlons. The King demanded time till the next morning to consider and consult his nobles on the subject. But so little did he expect the sudden rupture of the treaty that he began to discuss the form of his absolution. He thought it beneath his dignity to appear with bare feet before the Pope. The legates condescended to this request, provided the absolution were private. The next Oct. 26. day the Emperor required further delay, and entreated the Pope to remain over the Sunday. But the Pope declared that he had already condescended too far in leaving a general Council to confer with the Emperor, and returned with the utmost haste to Rheims.

At first the conduct of the Pope by no means found universal approval in the council. As the prohibition of the investiture of all churches and ecclesiastical possessions in any manner by lay hands was read, a murmur was heard not merely among the laity, but even among the clergy. It seemed that the Pope would resume all possessions which at any time might have belonged to the Church, and were now in lay hands; the dispute lasted with great acrimony till the evening. On the morning the Pope made a long speech so persuasive that the whole Council bowed to his authority. He proceeded to the excommunication of the Emperor, which he endeavored to array in more than usual awfulness. Four hundred and thirty-seven candles were brought and held lighted in the hands of each of the bishops and abbots. The long endless list of the excommunicated was read, of which the chief were Henry the Emperor, and Burdinus the Antipope. The Pope then solemnly absolved from their allegiance all the subjects of the Emperor. When this was over he pronounced his blessing, in the name of the Father, Son, Nov. 20. and Holy Ghost, and dismissed the Council. After a short time the Pope advanced to Gisors, and had an interview with King Henry of England. Henry boldly justified his seizure of the dukedom of his brother Robert, from the utter incapacity of that prince to administer the affairs of the realm. He had not imprisoned his brother; he had placed him in a royal castle, like a noble pilgrim who was broken with calamities; supplied him with food, and all that might suffice for a pleasant life. The Pope thought it wiser to be content with this hardly specious apology, and gently urged the Norman to make peace with the King of France.¹

¹ Orderic. Vitalis, i. 2, 13; W. Malmesbury.

Thus acknowledged by the greater part of Christendom, Calixtus II. determined, notwithstanding the unreconciled hostility of the Emperor, to reoccupy his see of Rome. He made a progress through France, distributing everywhere privileges, immunities, dignities; crossed the Alps, and entered Italy by the pass of Susa.¹

The journey of Calixtus through Italy was a triumphal procession. The Imperialists made no attempt to arrest his march. On his descent of the Alps he was met with loyal deputations from the Lombard cities. Giordano, the Archbishop of Milan, hastened to pay homage to his spiritual sovereign. Landulph, the historian, appeared before the Pope at Tortona to lodge a complaint against the Archbishop for unjustly depriving him of his church. "During the winter we tread not the grapes in the wine-vat," replied Lambert Bishop of Ostia;² the Archbishop of Milan, he intimated, was a personage too important to run the risk of his estrangement. Piacenza, Lucca, Pisa, vied with each other in paying honors to the Pope.³ As he drew near to Rome the Antipope fled and shut himself up in the strong fortress of Sutri. Rome had never received a Pope with greater apparent joy or unanimity. After a short stay Calixtus visited Monte Casino and Benevento. The Duke of Apulia, the Prince of Capua, and the other Norman vassals of the Church hastened to do homage to their liege lord. His royal descent as well as his high spiritual office, gave dignity

¹ Compare the *Regesta* from Nov. 27, 1119, to March, 1120.

² Landulph, *jun.*, c. 35.

³ He was at Piacenza, April 17; Lucca, early in May; Pisa, May 12, Rome, June 3; Monte Casino, July; Benevento, Aug. 8.

to the bearing of Calixtus II. He sustained with equal nobleness the part of King and Pope.

At the commencement of the following year he collected an army to besiege the Antipope Gregory VIII. in Sutri. Gregory in vain looked for succor, for rescue, to the Emperor, who had entirely abandoned, it might seem entirely forgotten, his cause. The Cardinal John of Crema commanded the papal forces. The Pope himself joined the expedition. Sutri made no determined resistance; either through fear or bribery the garrison, after eight days, consented to surrender the miserable Gregory. The cruel degradation of the Antipope. and unmanly revenge of Calixtus, if it were intended as an awful warning against illegitimate usurpers of the papal power, was a signal failure.¹ The mockery heaped on the unsuccessful Gregory had little effect in deterring future ambitious prelates from setting up as Antipopes. Whenever an Antipope was wanted an Antipope was at hand. Yet degradation and insult could go no further. On a camel instead of a white palfrey, with a bristling hogskin for the scarlet mantle, the Archbishop of Braga was placed with his face towards the rump of the animal, holding the tail for a bridle. In this attire he was compelled to accompany the triumphant procession of the Pope into Rome. He was afterwards dragged about from one convent-
April 23, 1121. prison to another, and died at length so utterly forgotten that the place of his death is doubtful.

The Pope and the Emperor might seem by the sud-

¹ "Ut ipse in suâ confunderetur erubescentiâ, et aliis exemplum præberet, ne similia ulterius attemptare præsumant." — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit. Callist.

den rapture of the negotiations at Moisson Affairs of Germany. and the public renewal of the excommunication at Rheims, to be committed to more implacable hostility. But this rupture, instead of alienating still further the German princes from the Emperor, appeared to strengthen his party. His conduct in that affair excited no disapprobation, no new adversaries availed themselves of the Pope's absolution to renounce their allegiance. In the West of the Empire, when he seemed most completely deserted, a sudden turn took place in his affairs. Many of the most powerful princes, even the Archbishop of Cologne, returned at least to doubtful allegiance. Saxony alone remained in rebellion, and in that province Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, having fled from his metropolitan city, was indefatigable in organizing the revolt.

Henry, having assembled a powerful army in Alsace, and having expelled the rebellious Bishops of Worms and Spire, marched upon Mentz, which he threatened to besiege as the head-quarters of the rebellion.

Albert, as legate of the Pope, appealed to the religion of the Saxons; he appointed fasts, he ordered public prayers to be offered in all the churches: he advanced at length at the head of an army, powerful enough to cope with that of the Emperor, to the relief of Mentz. The hostile armies of Germany were commanded by the temporal and spiritual head, the Emperor and the Primate: a battle seemed inevitable.

But a strong Teutonic feeling had arisen in both parties, and a disinclination to shed blood in a quarrel between the Church and the Empire, which might be reconciled by their commanding mediation. The more extravagant pretensions of both parties were equally

hostile to their interests. It was not the supreme feudal sovereign alone who was injured by the absolute immunity of all ecclesiastical property from feudal claims ; every temporal prince had either suffered loss or was in danger of suffering loss by this slow and irrevocable encroachment of the Church. They were jealous that the ecclesiastics should claim exemptions to which they could have no title. On the other hand it could by no means be their desire that the Emperor should fill all the great ecclesiastical sees, the principalities, as some were, either with his own favorites or sell them to the highest bidder (as some Emperors had been accused of doing, as arbitrary Emperors might do), and so raise a vast and dangerous revenue which, extorted from the Church, might be employed against their civil liberties. Both parties had gradually receded from their extreme claims, and the Pope and the Emperor had made such concessions as, but for mutual suspicion, might at Moisson have led to peace, and had reduced the quarrel almost to a strife of words.

After some negotiation a truce was agreed upon, twelve princes were chosen from each party to draw up the terms of a future treaty, and a Diet of the Empire summoned to meet at Michaelmas in Wurzburg.

The Emperor appeared with his more distinguished followers in Wurzburg, the Saxon army encamped at a short distance. Hostages were exchanged, and, as Wurzburg could not contain the throng, the negotiations were carried on in the plain without the city.

The Diet had full powers to ratify a peace for the
Treaty of Wurzburg. Empire ; the terms were simple but comprehensive. The Church and the Empire should each maintain its rights and revenues inviolable ; all

seized or confiscated property was to be restored to its rightful owner ; the rights of each estate of the Empire were to be maintained. An Imperial Edict was to be issued against thieves and robbers, or they were to be dealt with according to the ancient laws ; all violence and all disturbance of the peace to be suppressed. The King was to be obedient to the Pope, and with the consent and aid of the princes make peace with him, so that each should quietly possess his own, the Emperor the rights of the Empire, the Pope those of the Church. The bishops lawfully elected and consecrated retained their sees till the arrival of the Pope in Germany, those of Worms and Spire were to be restored to their dioceses ; hostages and prisoners to be liberated on both sides. But the dispute between the Pope and the Emperor concerning the investitures was beyond the powers of the Diet, and the papal excommunication was revocable by the Pope alone. These points therefore were reserved till the Pope should arrive in Germany to hold a General Council. But the Emperor gave the best pledge in his power for his sincerity in seeking reconciliation with the Church. He had granted a general amnesty to the rebellious prelates ; he had agreed to restore the expelled Bishops of Worms and Spire. Even Conrad, Archbishop of Salzburg, who had taken an active part in the war against Henry, had been compelled to fly, and to conceal himself in a cave for a year, returned to his bishopric. On their side the Saxon bishops did not decline to enter into communion with the Emperor ; for even the prelates most sternly adverse to Henry did not condescend to notice the papal absolution from their allegiance ; it was considered as something which had not taken place.

Notwithstanding an ill-timed dispute concerning the succession to the bishopric of Wurzburg, which led to some hostilities, and threatened at the last hour to break up the amicable settlement, affairs went smoothly on.

The Pope himself wrote with the earnestness and conciliatory tone of one disposed to peace. Feb. 19, 1122. He reminded Henry of their consanguinity, and welcomed him as the dutiful son of St. Peter, as worthy both as a man and as an Emperor of the more affectionate love and honor of the Holy See, as he had surpassed his later predecessors in obedience to the Church of Rome. He emphatically disclaimed all intention in the Church to trench on the prerogative of the Empire.¹

The treaty was framed at Mentz under the auspices of the papal legates, Lambert Bishop of Ostia, Saxo Cardinal of Monte Cælio, and the Cardinal Gregory. It was sealed with the golden seal of the Empire by the Chancellor, the Archbishop of Cologne; it was subscribed by the Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz, the Bishops of Bamberg, Spire, Augsburg, Utrecht, and Constance, and the Abbot of Fulda; by Duke Frederick of Swabia, Henry of Bavaria, the Margraves Boniface and Theobald, the Palsgrave of the Rhine, and some other princes.

So was it ratified at Worms by the papal legate and accepted by the German people.

These were the terms of this important treaty, which were read to the German nation amid loud applauses,

¹ "Nihil de tuo jure vindicare sibi curat ecclesia; nec regni nec imperii gloriam affectamus; obtineat ecclesia, quod Christi est; habeat Imperator quod suum est."

and received as the fundamental principles of the Papal and Imperial rights.

The Emperor gives up to God, to St. Peter, and to the Catholic Church, the right of investiture by the ring and the pastoral staff; he grants to the clergy throughout the Empire the right of free election; he restores to the Church of Rome, to all other churches and nobles, the possessions and feudal sovereignties which have been seized during the wars in his father's time and his own, those in his possession immediately, and he promises his influence to obtain restitution of those not in his possession. He grants peace to the Pope and to all his partisans, and pledges himself to protect, whenever he shall be thereto summoned, the Church of Rome in all things.

The Pope grants that all elections of bishops and abbots should take place in the presence of the Emperor or his commissioners, only without bribery and violence, with an appeal in cases of contested elections to the metropolitan and provincial bishops. The bishop elect in Germany was to receive, by the touch of the sceptre, all the temporal rights, principalities, and possessions of the see, excepting those which were held immediately of the See of Rome; and faithfully discharge to the Emperor all duties incident to those principalities. In all other parts of the Empire the royalties were to be granted to the bishop consecrated within six months. The Pope grants peace to the Emperor and his adherents, and promises aid and assistance on all lawful occasions.

The treaty was ratified by the most solemn religious ceremony. The papal legate, the Bishop of Ostia, celebrated the mass, administered the Eucharist

A.D. 1122.

to the Emperor, declared him to be reconciled with the Holy See, and received him and all his partisans with the kiss of peace into the bosom of the Catholic Church. The Lateran Council ratified this momentous treaty, which became thereby the law of Christendom.

Feb. 27,
1123.

So closed one period of the long strife between the Church and the Empire. The Christendom of our own calmer times, when these questions, excepting among rigid controversialists, are matters of remote history, may wonder that where the principles of justice, dominant at the time, were so plain and simple, and where such slight and equitable concessions on either side set this long quarrel at rest, Germany should be wasted by civil war, Italy suffer more than one disastrous invasion, one Emperor be reduced to the lowest degradation, more than one Pope be exposed to personal insult and suffering, in short, that such long, bloody, and implacable warfare should lay waste a large part of Europe, on points which admitted such easy adjustment. But, as usual in the collision of great interests, the point in dispute was not the sole, nor even the chief object of the conflict: it was on one part the total independence, and through the independence the complete ascendancy; on the other, if not the absolute subjugation, the secret subservience of the spiritual power; which the more sagacious and ambitious of each party aimed eventually at securing to themselves. Both parties had gradually receded from this remote and unacknowledged purpose, and now contended on open and ostensible ground. The Pope either abandoned as unattainable, or no longer aspired to make the Church absolutely independent both as to election and as to the possession

of vast feudal rights without the obligations of feudal obedience to the Empire. In Germany alone the bishops and abbots were sovereign princes of such enormous territorial possessions and exalted rank, that if constant and unswerving subjects and allies of the Pope, they would have kept the Empire in complete subjugation to Rome. But this rival sway had been kept down through the direct influence exercised by the Emperor in the appointment, and his theoretic power at least of withholding the temporalities of the great spiritual fiefs; and the exercise of this power led to monstrous abuses, the secularization of the Church, the transformation of bishops and abbots to laymen invested in mitres and cowls. The Emperor could not hope to maintain the evils of the old system, the direct appointment of his creatures, boys or rude soldiers, to those great sees or abbacies; or to sell them and receive in payment some of the estates of the Church, and so to create an unconstitutional and independent revenue. It was even a wiser policy, as concerned his temporal interests, to elevate the order in that decent and imposing character which belonged to their sacred calling — to Teutonize the Teutonic hierarchy.

Indirect influence through the chapters might raise up, if a more free and more respected, yet more loyal race of churchmen; if more independent of the Empire they would likewise be more independent of the Pope; they would be Germans as well as churchmen; become not the sworn, inmitigable enemies, but the allies, the bulwarks of the Imperial power. So in the subsequent contest the armies of the Hohenstaufen, at least of Frederick Barbarossa, appear commanded by the great

prelates of the Empire ; and even Frederick II., if he had been more of a German, less of an Italian sovereign, might, supported by the German hierarchy, have maintained the contest with greater hopes of success.

CHAPTER IV.

ST. BERNARD AND INNOCENT II.

CALIXTUS II. had restored peace to Christendom; his strong arm during the latter part of his Pontificate kept even Rome in quiet obedience. He compelled both citizens and strangers to abandon the practice of wearing arms; he levelled some of the strongholds from which the turbulent nobles sallied forth with their lawless followers to disturb the peace of the city, and to interfere in the election of Popes, or to defend some usurping Antipope against the legitimate Bishop of Rome: the tower of Cencius and that of Donna Bona were razed to the ground. But neither Calixtus nor Henry lived to see the effects of the pacification. The death of Calixtus took place a year before that of the Emperor.¹ With Henry V. closed the line of the Franconian Cæsars in Germany; the second family which, since the separation of the dominions of Charlemagne, had handed down the Empire for several generations in regular descent. Of the Franconian Emperors, the first had been the faithful allies of the Papacy; the restorers of the successors of St. Peter to freedom, power, and even sanctity, which they had lost,

¹ Death of Calixtus, 1124 (rather Dec. 13 or 14, 1123). The death of Henry, 1125, May 23. — Falco Beneventanus in *Chronic.*; Pandulphus Pisanus.

and seemed in danger of losing forever, as the slaves and instruments of the wild barons and potentates of Rome and the Romagna. The two later Kings, the Henrys, had been in perpetual and dangerous conflict with those Pontiffs whom their fathers had reinvested in dignity.

Calixtus had controlled, but not extinguished the Roman factions; they were only gathering strength and animosity to renew the strife for his spoils, to contest the appointment of his successors. Even on the death of Calixtus, a double election, but for the unwonted prudence and moderation of one of the candidates, might have broken out into a new schism, and a new civil war. The Frangipanis were at the head of one faction, Peter the son of Leo of the other.

A.D. 1123.

Dec. 15, 16.

They watched the last hours of the expiring Pontiff with outward signs of agreement, but with the inward determination each to supplant the other by the rapidity of his proceedings. Lambert of Ostia, the legate who had conducted the treaty of pacification in Germany, was the Pope of the Frangipani. Their party had the scarlet robe ready to invest him. While the assembled Bishops in the Church of San Pancrazio had already elected Tebaldo Buccapecco, the Cardinal of Santa Anastasia, and were singing the *Te Deum*, Robert Frangipani proclaimed Lambert as Pope Elect, amid the acclamations of the people. Happily, however, one was as sincerely humble as the other ambitious.¹ The Cardinal of Santa Anastasia yielded up his claim without hesitation; yet so doubtful did the legality of his election appear to the Pope himself, that,

¹ Jaffé however says, I think without ground, "*Voluntate an coactus abdicaverit, parum liquet.*"

twelve days after, he resigned the Papacy into the hands of the Cardinals, and went through the forms of a new election.

The Pontificate of Honorius II., during six years, was not marked by any great event, except ^{A.D. 1124-1130.} the accession of the Saxon house to the Imperial throne. Yet the thunders of the Vatican were not silent; his reign is marked by the anathemas which he pronounced, not now against invaders of his ecclesiastical rights and possessions. The temporal interests and the spiritual supremacy of the Popes became more and more identified; all invasion of the actual property of the Pope, or the feudal superiority which he might claim, was held as sacrilege, and punished by the spiritual censure of excommunication. Already the Lateran Council, under Calixtus, had declared that any one who attacked the city of Benevento, being the Pope's (a strong city of refuge, in the south of Italy, either against a hostile Emperor or the turbulent Romans, was of infinite importance to the Pontiff), was under anathema. The feudal sovereignty of the whole South of Italy, which the Popes, on some vague claim as representatives of the Emperors, had appropriated to the Roman See, and which the Normans, holding only by the precarious tenure of conquest, were not inclined to dispute, since it confirmed their own rights, was protected by the same incongruous arms; and not by these arms alone, Honorius himself at times headed the Papal forces in the South.¹ When Roger the Norman laid claim to the succession of William Duke of

¹ See Chron. Foss. Nov., Falco Beneventan., Romuald. Salernit. for brief notices of the Pope's campaigns. Apud Muratori, G. R. It. vii. Council at Troja, Nov. 11, 1127.

Apulia, who had died childless, the Pope being unfavorable to his pretensions, he was cut off from the Church of Christ by the same summary sentence.

In Germany all was peace between the Empire and the Papacy. Lothair the Saxon, the faithful head of the Papal party, had been elected to the Empire. Honorius, in gratitude for past services, and in prophetic dread of the rising power of the Hohenstaufen, hastened to recognize the Emperor. Lothair, in his humble submission, did not demand the homage of the clergy for their Imperial fiefs.¹ Conrad, the nephew of the deceased King Henry, having attempted to seize the kingdom of Italy, was excommunicated April 24, 1128. as a rebel against his rightful Sovereign. The humiliation of his rival Frederick of Swabia, and the failure of Conrad, left the Papalizing Emperor in his undisturbed supremacy.

The death of Honorius was the signal for a more Feb. 14, 1130. violent collision between the ruling factions at Rome. They watched the dying Pope with Confested election. Innocent II. Anacletus II. indecent impatience. In secret, (it was asserted before the death, certainly on the day of the death and before the funeral of Honorius,) a minority of the Cardinals, but those, in their own estimation and in that of their adherents, the most eminent, elected Gregory, the Cardinal of St. Angelo, who took the name of Innocent II.² The more numerous party,

¹ Jaffé, Lothair, p. 36, &c.

² St. Bernard himself admits some irregularity at least in the election of Innocent. "Nam etsi quid minus forte solenniter, et minus ordinabiliter processit, in eâ quæ præcessit, ut hostes unitatis contendunt." Bernard argues that they ought to have waited the formal examination of this point, and not proceeded to another election. But if the election was irregular and uncanonical, it was null of itself.

waiting a more decent and more canonical time for their election, chose the Cardinal Peter Leonis, one of the sons of that Peter who had so long been conspicuous in Roman politics. He called himself Anacletus II. On his side Anacletus had the more canonical election, the majority of the Cardinals,¹ the strongest party in Rome. He immediately made overtures to Roger Duke of Sicily, who had been excommunicated by Honorius. The Sicilian espoused at once the cause of Anacletus, in order to deserve the title of King, the aim of his ambition. Thus there was a complete revolution in the parties at Rome. The powerful family of Peter Leonis and the Normans were on the side of the Pope, eventually reputed the Antipope; the Emperor with all Northern Christendom united for the successful, as he was afterwards called, the orthodox Pontiff. The enemies of Leo (Anacletus), who scrupled at no calumny,² attributed his success to his powerful connections of family and of interest. He inherited a vast patrimonial property; he had increased it by a large share in the exactions of the Curia, the Chancery of Rome, of which he had the command, and in legations. These treasures he had carefully

¹ There were 16 cardinals for Innocent, 32 for Anacletus. — Anonym. apud Baronium, *Epist.*, pp. 191, 192, 196. Other writers, of inferior authority, deny this.

² "Qui licet monachus, presbyter, cardinalis esset, scorto conjugatus, monachas, sororem propriam, etiam consanguineas ad instar canis quoquo modo habere potuit, non defecit." — *Epist. Mantuin. Episcop.* apud Neugart, *diplom. Alemanniæ*, 63, 64. Yet there seems no doubt that the Epistle of Peter the Cardinal, written by St. Bernard (notwithstanding Mabillon's doubts), was addressed to Anacletus. "Diligimus enim bonam famam vestram, reveremur quam in vobis audivimus circa res Dei sollicitudinem et sinceritatem." Jaffé (p. 89) well observes that it would be fatal to the character of Calixtus II. to have promoted a man of such monstrous dissoluteness to the cardinalate.

hoarded for his great object, the Pontificate. Besides this, he scrupled not, it is said, to convert the sacred wealth of the churches to his use; and when the Christians trembled to break up the silver vessels and crucifixes, he called in the Jews to this unholy work. Thus it is acknowledged that almost all Rome was on his side; Rome, won, as his enemies aver, by these guilty and sacrilegious means and maintained by the harshest cruelties.¹

Innocent had in Rome the Frangipanis, a strong minority of the Cardinals, the earlier though questionable election; he had the indelible prejudice against his adversary — his name and descent from a Jew and an usurer.² But he obtained before long the support of the Emperor Lothair, of the King of France, of Henry King of England, and, greater than these, of one to whom he owed their faithful aid, who ruled the

¹ Innocent thus arraigns his rival: — “Qui papatum a longis retro temporibus affectaverat, parentum violentiâ, sanguinis effusione, destructione sacrarum imaginum, beati Petri cathedram occupavit et peregrinos ac religiosos quosdam ad apostolorum limina venientes captos, et tetrâ carceris squaloribus ac ferreis vinculis mancipatos fame, siti, diversisque tormentorum generibus tormentare non desinit.” — Pisa, June 20, apud Jaffé, p. 561. On the other hand Anacletus asserts, “Clerus omnis Romanus individuâ nobis charitate cohæret; præfectus urbis Leo Frangipane cum filio et Cencio Frangipane [this was after the flight of Innocent] et nobiles omnes, et plebs omnis Romana consuetam nobis fidelitatem fecerunt.” — Baronius, sub ann. 1130.

² In the account of the Council of Rheims by Ordericus Vitalis, we read that Calixtus II. declared his willingness to liberate the son of Peter the son of Leo, whom he had brought with him as one of the hostages of the former treaty with the Emperor. “So saying, he pointed to a dark pale youth, more like a Jew or a Hagarene than a Christian, clothed in rich raiment, but deformed in person. The Franks, who saw him standing by the Pope, mocked him, imprecated disgrace and ruin on his head from their hatred to his father, whom they knew to be a most unscrupulous usurer.” This deformed boy could not be the future Pope, then probably a monk; most likely it was a brother.

minds of all these Sovereigns, Bernard, the Abbot of Clairvaux.

For half this century the Pope ceases to be the centre around whom gather the great events of Christian history, from whose heart or from whose mind flow forth the impulses which animate and guide Latin Christendom, towards whom converge the religious thoughts of men. Bernard of Clairvaux, now rising to the height of his power and influence, is at once the leading and the governing head of Christendom. He rules alike the monastic world, in all the multiplying and more severe convents which were springing up in every part of Europe, the councils of temporal sovereigns, and the intellectual developments of the age. He is peopling all these convents with thousands of ardent votaries of every rank and order; he heals the schism in the Papacy; he preaches a new crusade, in which a King and an Emperor lead the armies of the Cross; he is believed by an admiring age to have confuted Abélard himself, and to have repressed the more dangerous doctrines of Arnold of Brescia. His almost worshipping admirers adorn his life with countless miracles; posterity must admit the almost miraculous power with which he was endowed of guiding the minds of men in passive obedience. The happy congeniality of his character, opinions, eloquence, piety, with all the stronger sentiments and passions of the time, will account in great part for his ascendancy; but the man must have been blessed with an amazing native power and greatness, which alone could raise him so high above a world actuated by the same influences.

Bernard did not originate this new outburst of mo-

nasticism, which had already made great progress in Germany, and was growing to its height in parts of France. He was a dutiful son rather than one of the parents of that great Cistercian order, which was now commencing its career in all its more attractive seclusion from the world, and its more than primitive austerity of discipline; which in a short time became famous, and through its fame covered France, parts of England, and some other countries, with new monasteries under a more rigorous rule, and compelled some of the old institutions to submit to a harsher discipline. These foundations, after emulating or surpassing the ancient Benedictine brotherhoods in austerity, poverty, obedience, solitude, grew to equal and surpass them in splendor, wealth, and independent power.

It was this wonderful attribute of the monastic system to renew its youth, which was the life of mediæval Christianity; it was ever reverting of itself to the first principles of its constitution. It seized alike on all the various nations which now formed Latin Christendom; the Northern as the Southern, the German as the Italian. In this adventurous age there must be room and scope for every kind of religious adventure. The untamable independence and individuality of the Teutonic character, now dominant throughout Germany, France, and England, still displays itself, notwithstanding the complicated system of feudal tenures and their bondage, in the perpetual insubordination of the nobles to the sovereign, in private wars, in feats of hardihood and enterprise, bordering constantly on the acts of the robber, the freebooter, and the pirate. It had been at once fostered by, and found vent in the Crusades, which called on every one to become a war-

rior on his own account, and enrolled him not as a conscript or even as a feudal retainer, but as a free and voluntary soldier of the Cross, seeking glory or plunder for himself, or working out his own salvation by deeds of valor against the Unbelievers.

It was the same within the more immediate sphere of religion. When that yearning for independence, that self-isolating individuality ^{Thirst for religious adventure} was found in connection with the strong and profound passion for devotion, there was nothing in the ordinary and established forms to satisfy the aspirations of this inordinate piety. Notwithstanding, or rather because of the completely organized system of Church government throughout the West, which gave to every province its metropolitan, to every city its bishop, to every parish its priest, there could not but be a perpetual insurrection, as it were, of men ambitious of something higher, more peculiar, more extraordinary, more their own. The stated and uniform service of the Church, the common instruction, must be suited to the ordinary level of faith and knowledge: they knew no change, no progress, no accommodation to more earnest or craving spirits. The almost universal secularization of the clergy would increase this holy dissatisfaction. Even the Pope had become a temporal sovereign, the metropolitan a prince, the bishop a baron, the priest perhaps the chaplain to a marauding army. At all events the ceremonial of the Church went on in but stately uniformity; the most religious man was but a member of the same Christian flock; there was little emulation or distinction. But all this time monastic Christianity was in the theory of the Church the only real Christian perfection; the one sublime, almost the one safe course,

was the total abnegation of the monk, renunciation of the world, solitude, asceticism, stern mortification. Man could not inflict upon himself too much humiliation and misery. The true Christian life was one long unbroken penance. Holiness was measured by suffering; the more remote from man the nearer to God. All human sympathies, all social feelings, all ties of kindred, all affections were to be torn up by the roots from the groaning spirit; pain and prayer, prayer and pain, were to be the sole, stirring, unwearying occupations of a saintly life.

All these more aspiring and restless and insatiable spirits the monasteries invited within their hallowed walls; to all these they promised peace. But they could rarely fulfil their promise; even they could not satisfy the yearnings for religious adventure. Most of the old monasteries which held the rule either of St. Benedict or of Cassian had become wealthy, and suffered the usual effects of wealth. Some had altogether relaxed their discipline, had long renounced poverty; and the constant dissensions, the appeals to the bishop, to the metropolitan, or where, as they all strove to do, they had obtained exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, to the Pope, showed how entirely the other great vow, obedience to the abbot or prior, had become obsolete. The best were regular and tranquil; they had achieved their labors, they had fertilized their immediate territory, and as though they had now but to enjoy the fruits of their toil, they sunk to indolent repose. Even where the discipline was still severe, it was monotonous, to some extent absolute; its sanctity was exacted, habitual, unawakening. All old establishments are impatient of innovation; a higher flight of

devotion becomes insubordination, or a tacit reproach on the ordinary course. Monasticism had been and was ever tracing the same cycle. Now the wilderness, the utter solitude, the utmost poverty, the contest with the stubborn forest and unwholesome morass, the most exalted piety, the devotion which had not hours enough during the day and night for its exercise, the rule which could not be enforced too strictly, the strongly competing asceticism, the inventive self-discipline, the inexhaustible, emulous ingenuity of self-torture, the boastful servility of obedience : then the fame for piety, the lavish offerings of the faithful, the grants of the repentant lord, the endowments of the remorseful king — the opulence, the power, the magnificence. The wattled hut, the rock-hewn hermitage, is now the stately cloister ; the lowly church of wood the lofty and gorgeous abbey ; the wild forest or heath the pleasant and umbrageous grove ; the marsh a domain of intermingling meadow and cornfields ; the brawling stream or mountain torrent a succession of quiet tanks or pools fattening innumerable fish. The superior, once a man bowed to the earth with humility, careworn, pale, emaciated, with a coarse habit bound with a cord, with naked feet, is become an abbot on his curvetting palfrey, in rich attire, with his silver cross borne before him, travelling to take his place amid the lordliest of the realm.

New orders therefore and new institutions were ever growing out of the old, and hosts of youthful zealots were ripe and eager for their more extreme demands of self-sacrifice, and that which appeared to be self-abandonment, but in fact was often a loftier form of self-adoration. Already, centuries past, in the Bene-

dictine abbeys, the second Benedict (of Aniane) had commenced a new era of discipline, mortification, saintliness according to the monastic notion of saintship. But that era, like the old one, had gradually passed away. Again, in the preceding century, Clugny had displayed this marvellous inward force, this reconstructing, reorganizing, reanimating energy of monasticism. It had furnished the line of German pontiffs to the papacy, it had trained Hildebrand for the papal throne and placed him upon it. But Clugny was now undergoing the inevitable fate of degeneracy: it was said that the Abbot Pontius had utterly forgotten the stern inflexibility of his great predecessor St. Hugh: he had become worldly, and as worldly, weak in discipline.

But in the mean while, in a remote and almost inaccessible corner of Burgundy, had been laid the foundations of a community which by the time that the mind of Bernard of Clairvaux should be ripe for his great change, would be prepared to satisfy the fervid longings even of a spirit so intensely burning with the fire of devotion. The first origin of this fraternity is one of the most striking and characteristic stories of this religious age. Two brothers of the noble house of Molesme were riding through a wild forest, in arms, on their way to a neighboring tournament. Suddenly in the mind of each rose the awful thought, "What if I should murder my brother, and so secure the whole of our inheritance!" The strong power of love, of virtue, of religion, or whatever influence was employed by the divine blessing, wrestled down in each the dark temptation. Some years after they passed again the same dreary road;

the recollection of their former trial came back upon their minds ; they shuddered at once at the fearful power of the Tempter. They hastened to confess themselves to a holy hermit ; they then communicated each to the other their fratricidal thoughts ; they determined to abandon forever a world which abounded in such dreadful suggestions, to devote their lives to the God who had saved them from such appalling sin. So rose at Molesme a small community, which rapidly became a monastery. The brothers, however, disappear, at least are not the most conspicuous in the history of this community. In the monastery, in the forest of Colan near Molesme, arose dissension, at length secession. Some of the most rigid, including the abbot, the prior, and Stephen Harding, an Englishman, sought a more complete solitude, a more obstinate wilderness to tame, more sense-subduing poverty, more intense mortification. They found it in a desert place on the borders of Champagne and Burgundy. Nothing could appear more stubborn, more dismal, more hopeless than this spot ; it suited their rigid mood ; they had more than once the satisfaction of almost perishing by famine. The monastery of Cîteaux had not yet softened away the savage character of the wilderness around when it opened its gates to Bernard of Clairvaux. Stephen Harding had become its abbot, and Stephen was the true founder of the Cistercian Order.

Stephen Harding had been bestowed as an offering by his pious parents on the monastery of Sherborne in Dorsetshire. There he received his education, there he was fed with cravings for higher devotion which Sherborne could not satisfy. He wandered as a pilgrim to

Rome; he returned with his spiritual wants still more pressing, more fastidious, more insatiate. Among the brethren of Molesme he found for a time a relief for his soul's necessities: but even from Molesme he was driven forth in search of profound peace, of more full satisfaction; and he was among the seven who retired into the more desolate and unapproachable Citeaux.¹

Citeaux. Yet already had Citeaux, though still rude and struggling as it were, with the forest and the marsh, acquired fame. Odo, the mighty Duke of Burgundy, the first patron of the new community, had died in the Holy Land. Ere he expired he commanded that his remains should not rest in the vaults of his cathedral at Dijon, or any of the more stately abbeys of his land, where there were lordly prelates or chapters of priests to celebrate daily the splendid masses with their solemn music for his soul. He desired that they should rest in the humble chapel of Citeaux, blessed by the more prevailing prayers of its holy monks. In after ages Citeaux, become magnificent, was the burying-place of the Dukes of Burgundy; but over their gorgeous marble tombs it might be questioned whether such devout and earnest supplications were addressed to heaven as by the simple choir of Stephen Harding.

But its glory and its power rose not from the sepulture of the Dukes of Burgundy, but from the entrance of the living Bernard within its walls.² Bernard was

¹ Compare the Life of Harding, in the Lives of the English Saints. If the writers of some of these biographies had condescended to write history rather than to revive legend, they might, from their research and exquisite charm of style, have enriched our literature.

² The Life of St. Bernard (the first book) by William the Abbot (Gulielmus Abbas), was written during his lifetime, but without the

born of noble parentage in Burgundy. His father, Tecelin, was a man of great bravery and unimpeachable honor and justice; his mother, Alith, likewise of high birth, a model of devotion and charity. Bernard was the third of six brothers; he had one sister. The mother, who had secretly vowed all her children to God, took the chief part in their early education, especially in that of Bernard, a simple and studious, a thoughtful and gentle youth, yet even in childhood of strong will and visionary imagination. The mother's death confirmed the influence of her life. Having long practised secretly the severest monastic discipline, she breathed out her spirit amid the psalms of the clergy around her bed: the last movement of her lips was praise to God.

The world was open to the youth of high birth, beautiful person, graceful manners, irresistible influence. The Court would at once have welcomed a young knight, so endowed, with her highest honors, her most intoxicating pleasures; the Church would have trained a noble disciple so richly gifted for her most powerful bishoprics or her wealthiest abbeys. He closed his eyes upon the world, on the worldly Church, with stern determination. He became at once master of his passions. His eyes had dwelt too long and too curiously on a beautiful female; he plunged to the neck in a pool of cold water. His chastity underwent, but unattainted, severer trials. Yet he resolved to abandon this incorrigible world altogether. He inquired for the poorest, the most inaccessible, the most austere of monasteries. It was

knowledge or sanction of Bernard. The second book bears the name of Bernard, Abbot of Beauvale.

that of Citeaux. He arrived at the gates, but not alone. Already his irresistible influence had drawn around him thirty followers, all equally resolute in the renunciation of secular life, in submission to the most rigorous discipline; some, men of middle life, versed in, but weary of, the world; most, like himself, youths of noble birth, with life untried and expanding in its most dazzling promise before them. But this was not all; his mother's vow must be fulfilled. One after the other the strange and irresistible force of his character enthralled his brothers, and at length his sister. Two of the brothers with an uncle followed his steps at once: the elder, Guido, was married; his wife refused to yield up her claims on her husband's love. A seasonable illness enforced her submission; she too retired to a convent. A wound in the side, prophesied, it was said, by Bernard, brought another, a gallant warrior, as a heart-stricken penitent into his company. When they all left the castle of their fathers, where they had already formed a complete monastic brotherhood, Guido, the elder, addressed Nivard the youngest son. "To you remains the whole patrimony of our house." "Earth to me and heaven to you, that is no fair partition," said the boy. He lingered a short time with his aged father and then joined the rest. Even the father died a monk of Clairvaux in the arms of Bernard. But it was not on his own kindred alone that Bernard wrought with this commanding power. When he was to preach, wives hurried away their husbands, mothers withdrew their sons, friends their friends, from the resistless magic of his eloquence.

Notwithstanding its fame, the Cistercian monastery up to this time had been content with a few unincreas-

ing votaries. Warlike and turbulent Burgundy furnished only here and there some conscience-stricken disciple to its dreary cells. The accession of the noble Bernard, of his kindred and his followers, raised at once the popularity and crowded the dormitories of this remote cloister. But Bernard himself dwelt in subjection, in solitude, in study. He was alone, except when on his knees with the rest in the choir; the forest oaks and beeches were his beloved companions; he diligently read the sacred scriptures; he strove to work out his own conception of perfect and angelic religion. He attained a height of abstraction from earthly things which might have been envied by an Indian Yogue. He had so absolutely withdrawn his senses from communion with the world that they seemed dead to all outward impressions: his eyes did not tell him whether his chamber was ceiled or not, whether it had one window or three. Of the scanty food which he took rather to avert death than to sustain life, his unconscious taste had lost all perception whether it was nauseous or wholesome. Yet Bernard thought himself but in his novitiate; others might have attained, he had but begun his sanctification. He labored with the hardest laborers, discharged the most menial offices, was everybody's slave; the more degrading the office the more acceptable to Bernard.

But the monastery of Stephen Harding could no longer contain its thronging votaries. From this metropolis of holiness Bernard was chosen to lead *clairvaux*, the first colony. There was a valley in Champagne, not far from the river Aube, called the Valley of Wormwood, infamous as a den of robbers: Bernard and his companions determined to change it into a temple of

God. It was a savage, terrible solitude, so utterly barren that at first they were reduced to live on beech-leaves: they suffered the direst extremity of famine, until the patient faith of Bernard was rewarded by supplies pouring in from the reverential piety of the neighboring peasants.

To the gate of Clairvaux (Bernard's new monastery had taken that musical name, to which he has given immortality) came his sister, who was nobly married, in great state and with a splendid retinue. Not one of her brothers would go out to see her — she was spurned from the door as a sinner. "If I am a sinner," she meekly replied, "I am one of those for whom Christ died, and have the greater need of my brothers' kindly counsel. Command, I am ready to obey!" Bernard was moved; he could not separate her from her husband, but he adjured her to renounce all her worldly pomp. Humbeline obeyed, devoted herself to fasting and prayer, and at length retired into a convent.

Bernard's life would have been cut short by his austerities; this slow suicide would have deprived the Church of the last of her Fathers. But he had gone to receive orders from the Bishop of Châlons, William of Champeaux, the great dialectician, the teacher and the adversary of Abélard. With him he contracted a strong friendship. The wise counsel, and something like the pious fraud (venial here if ever) of this good prelate, compelled him to support his health, that most precious gift of God, without which the other high gifts of the Creator were without value.¹

¹ The more mature wisdom of Bernard viewed this differently. "Non ergo est temperantia in solis resecandis superfluis, est et in admittendis necessariis." — De Consider., i. viii. Compare the whole chapter.

The fame and influence of Bernard spread rapidly and widely; his irresistible preaching awed and won all hearts. Everywhere Bernard was called in as the great pacificator of religious, and even of civil dissensions. His justice, his mildness, were equally commanding and persuasive. It was a free and open court, to which all might appeal without cost; from which all retired, even if without success, without dissatisfaction; convinced, if condemned by Bernard, of his own wrongfulness. His wondering followers saw miracles in all his acts,¹ prophecies in all his words. The Gospels contain not such countless wonders as the life of Bernard. Clairvaux began to send forth its colonies; to Clairvaux all looked back with fervent attachment to their founder, and carried his name with them by degrees through France, and Italy, and Germany, to England and Spain.

Bernard, worthy as he was, according to the biographer, to be compelled to accept them, firmly declined all ecclesiastical dignities. The Abbot of Clairvaux, with all the wealth and all the honors of the Church at his feet, while he made and unmade Popes, remained but the simple Abbot.

From the schism in the Papal See between Innocent II. and Anacletus II., his life is the history of the Western Church.

Innocent, not without difficulty, had escaped from Rome, had dropped down to the mouth of the Tiber, and reached the port of Pisa. Mes-
sengers were immediately despatched to secure

May. June,
1130.
Innocent in
France.

¹ Some of them, of course, sink to the whimsical and the puerile. On one occasion he excommunicated the flies, which disturbed and defiled a church; they fell dead, and were swept off the floor by baskets-full.

the support of the Transalpine Sovereigns, more especially of Louis the Fat, the King of France. The King, who had now become a recognized protector of the Pope, summoned a Council of the Archbishops and Bishops of the realm at Etampes. Both the King and the Prelates imperatively required the presence of Bernard, the holy Abbot of Clairvaux. Bernard arrived, torn reluctant, and not without fear, from his tranquil seclusion, and thus plunged at once into the affairs of the world. The whole assembly, the King and the Prelates, with flattering unanimity, referred the decision of this momentous question to him alone. Thus was Bernard in one day the arbiter of the religious destinies of Christendom. Was he so absolutely superior to that last infirmity of noble minds as to be quite undazzled by the unexpected majesty of his position? He prayed earnestly; did he severely and indifferently examine this great cause? The burning passion of his letters, after he had embraced the cause of Innocent, does not impress the unbiased inquirer with the calmness of his deliberations. To the Archbishop of Tours, who was slow to acknowledge the superior validity of Sept. 11, 1130. Innocent's claims, he writes peremptorily — "The abomination of desolation is in the holy places. Antichrist, in persecuting Innocent, is persecuting all innocence: banished from Rome, he is accepted by the world."¹

Innocent hastened to the hospitable shores of France. Oct. 25. He landed at St. Gilles, in Provence, and proceeded by Viviers and Puy, in Auvergne, to the monastery of Clugny. There he was received, in the King's name, by Suger, Abbot of St. Denys, and pro-

¹ "Pulsus ab urbe, ab orbe receptus." — Epist. 124.

ceeded with horses and with a suitable retinue upon his journey. At Clermont he held a Council, Nov. 18, 29. and received the allegiance of two of the great Prelates of Germany, those of Salzburg and Munster. Near Orleans he was welcomed by the King and his family with every mark of reverence and submission. At Chartres another monarch, Henry I. of Jan. 30. 1131. England, acknowledged Innocent as the legitimate successor of St. Peter.¹ The influence of Bernard had overruled the advice of the English Prelates, and brought this second kingly spiritual vassal, though reluctant, to the feet of Innocent. "Thou fearest the sin of acknowledging Innocent: answer thou for thy other sins, be that upon my head."² Such was the language of Bernard to the King of England. The Pontiff condescended to visit Rouen, where the Norman Barons, and even the Jews of the city, made him splendid presents. From Germany had come May 10. an embassy to declare, that the Emperor Lothair and a Council of sixteen Bishops, at Wurtzburg, had acknowledged Innocent. Anacletus was not only rejected, but included under proscription with the disobedient Frederick the Hohenstaufen and Conrad the King of Italy; they and all their partisans were menaced with excommunication. The ambassadors in- Council of Rheims. Oct. 18. vited Innocent to visit Germany. He held his first Council at Rheims, where he crowned the King of France and his infant son. He visited, before or after the Council, other parts of France. He was at Etampes, Châlons, Cambray, Laon, Paris, Beauvais, Compiègne, Auxerre, as well as at Liège, Rouen, Gisors

¹ William Malmesbury. — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit

² Vita Bernardi.

Pont-Ysère, with Bernard as his inseparable companion. In public affairs he appeared to consult his Cardinals ; but every measure had been previously discussed in his private conferences with the Abbot of Clairvaux.

At Liège.
March 22,
1131.

Bernard accompanied him to Liège. The Pope was received with the highest honors by the Emperor Lothair ; the Emperor held the reins of the Pope's white palfrey ; but to the dismay of Innocent and his Cardinals, Lothair renewed the old claim to the investitures ;¹ and seemed disposed to enforce his demand as the price of his allegiance, if not by stronger measures. Innocent thought of the fate of Paschal, and trembled at the demand of the Barbarian. But the eloquence of Bernard overawed the Emperor : Lothair submitted to the spell of his authority.² On his return from Liège, the Pope visited the Abbey of Clairvaux. It was a strange contrast with the magnificence of his reception in the stately churches of Rheims, of Rouen, and of Liège, which were thronged with the baronial clergy, and their multitudes of clerical attendants, and rich with the ornaments offered by pious kings and princes ; nor less the contrast with the gorgeous state of the wealthy monasteries, even the now splendid, almost luxurious Clugny. He was met at Clairvaux by the poor of Christ, not clad in purple and fine linen, but in tattered raiment ; not bearing Gospels or sacred books embossed in gold, but a rude stone

¹ "Episcoporum sibi restitui investituras, quas ab ejus prædecessore Imperatore Henrico, Romana Ecclesia vindicarat." — Ernold. Vit. Bernard.

² "Sed nec Leodii cervicibus imminens mucro barbaricus compulit acquiescere importunis improbisque postulationibus iracundi atque irascentis regis." — S. Bernard, Epist. 150. Bernard has rather overcharged the wrath of the meek Lothair.

cross. No trumpet sounded, no tumultuous shouts were heard ; no one lifted his looks from the earth, no curious eye wandered abroad to gaze on the ceremony ; the only sound was a soft and lowly chant. The Prelates and the Pope were moved to tears. The Roman clergy were equally astonished at the meanness of the Church furniture, the nakedness of the walls ; not less by the hardness and scantiness of the fare, the coarsest bread and vegetables, instead of the delicacies to which they were accustomed ; a single small fish had been procured for the Pope. They had little desire to sojourn long at Clairvaux.¹

Bernard could boast that Innocent was now acknowledged, and chiefly through his influence, by the Kings of France, England, Spain, and by the Emperor. The more powerful clergy be-
Innocent acknowledged by all the Transalpine kings.
 yond the Alps, all the religious communities, the Camaldulites, the Vallombrosans, the Carthusians, those of Clugny, with other Benedictines ; his own Cistercians, in all their wide-spreading foundations, were on the same side. In Italy, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the Bishops of Pavia, Pistoia, Asti, and Parma, offered their allegiance. Of all the Sovereigns of Europe, Duke Roger of Sicily alone, bribed by the promise of a crown, adhered to his rival.

Bernard has now become an ardent, impassioned, disdainful partisan ; he has plunged heart and soul into the conflict and agitation of the world.² Anacletus

¹ Epist. 125.

² Bernard insists throughout on the canonical election of Innocent. In one place he doubtfully asserts the numbers to have been in favor of Innocent: "Cujus electio sanior numerum eligentium et numero vincens et merito." In other passages he rests the validity of the election altogether on the soundness of his adherents. It is the "dignitas eligentium. Hanc

had dared to send his legates into France: Aquitaine had generally espoused his cause. "Why not," writes the indignant Bernard to the Bishops of that province, "to Persia, to Decapolis, to the farthest Scythians?" Bernard's letters are addressed to the cities of Italy in terms of condescending praise and commanding authority rather than of meek persuasion. He exhorts them, Genoa more especially, which seemed to have been delighted with his presence, to reject the insidious alliance of the King of Sicily.¹ He threatens Milan, and hints that the Pope may raise bishops into archbishops, degrade archbishops into bishops. His power over the whole clergy knows no limitation. Bernard offers his mediation; but the price of reconciliation is not only submission to the spiritual power of Pope Innocent, but to the renunciation of Conrad, who still claimed the kingdom of Italy. They must make satisfaction, not to the Pope alone, but to the Emperor Lothair, the Pope's ally.²

The Emperor Lothair had promised to reinstate Innocent in the possession of Rome. Innocent entered Italy; he was received in Asti, Novara, Piacenza, Cremona, Brescia; he met the Emperor on the plains of Nov. 8, 1132. Roncaglia. From Piacenza he moved to Pisa, reconciled that city with her rising rival Genoa, and

enim, ni fallor, partem saniozem invenies." — Epist. 126. "Electio meliorum, approbatio plurium, et quod hic efficacius est, morum attestatio Innocentium apud omnes commendant, summum confirmant Pontificem." Consult these three epistles, of which the rhetoric is more powerful than the argument.

¹ "Habet tamen ducem Apuliæ, sed solum ex principibus, ipsumque usurpatæ coronæ mercede ridicula comparatum." — Anacletus had kept his compact, and advanced Roger to the kingdom of Sicily, Sept. 27, 1130. — Epist. 129 to 134. Some of these were written (Epist. 129) during Bernard's progress through Italy.

² Epist. 137, addressed to the Empress.

rewarded the obedience of Genoa by raising the see into an archbishopric. The fleets of Genoa March, 1133. and Pisa became the most useful allies of the Pope. The next year the Emperor and the Pope advanced to Rome, Bernard still by the side of the con- April 30. quering Pontiff. Anacletus did not venture to defend the city; he retired beyond the Tiber, occupied the Vatican, and maintained the Castle of St. Angelo. On either side of the river sat a Pope launching his interdict against his adversary. The Pope rewarded the Emperor's fidelity by crowning him and his Empress Richilda with great solemnity in the Lateran Church. Lothair swore to protect the Pope and the royalties of St. Peter to the utmost of his power; to en- June 4. force the restoration of all the rights and possessions withheld by violence from the See. But the presence of Lothair was the only safeguard of Innocent in Rome. No sooner had the Emperor returned to Germany than Innocent retired to Pisa, which, in St. Bernard's words, had the dignity of becoming a second Rome, the seat of exiled Pontiffs. Bernard was indignant at the long though necessary tardiness of the Emperor. It was not for him to excite to war, but it was for the Emperor to vindicate his throne from the Sicilian usurper; to defend the Church from the Jewish schismatic. His letter is that of a superior, under the guise of the lowest humility, dictating what is irrefragably right; in its address it is the supplication of a suitor; in its substance, in its spirit, a lofty reprimand.¹ He rebukes him for other weaknesses; for neglecting the interests of God by allowing the Church of St. Gingoulph to be oppressed; he rebukes him for his ingratitude to Pisa,

¹ Epist. 139. 140.

always the loyal subject and the most powerful ally of the Empire.

It was not till the fourth year of Innocent's retirement had begun (at Pisa¹ he exercised all the functions of a Pope, except over Rome and in the south of Italy), that Lothair appeared again under the Alps at the head of a formidable army. The Pope, at the head of one division, marched against the cities in the neighborhood of Rome; Lothair against the great ally of Anacletus, the King of Sicily. Lothair subdued the March of Ancona, the Principality of Capua, and almost the whole of Apulia. But this conquest endangered the amity between the Emperor and the Pope. Each claimed the right of investiture. Since the Norman conquest the Popes had maintained their strange claim to sovereignty over the whole kingdom of Naples; their right was grounded on the exercise of the right. The Emperor, as Emperor and King of Italy, declared himself undoubted sovereign of all which had not been expressly granted by his predecessors to the Holy See. A compromise took place; the new Duke Rainer swore fealty both to the Emperor and to the Pope. The King of Sicily had quietly withdrawn his troops, and waited his opportunity, when the Emperor should return to Germany,² to resume the offensive. Anacletus, in his impregnable fortress of St. Angelo, Jan. 25, 1138. defied his enemies. But his death relieved Innocent from his obstinate antagonist. The descendant of the Jew was buried secretly, lest his body, like that of Formosus, should be torn from its resting-

¹ Innocent was at Pisa from Nov. 16, 1133, to Feb. 28, 1137. He was on the plain of Roncaglia, Nov. 3, 1136.

² The Emperor Lothair died on his return to Germany, Dec. 3-4, 1137.

place by the vengeance of his enemies. An Antipope was elected two months after the death of Anacletus; he held his state but for ^{March to} ^{May '29.} two months more. For Innocent had returned to Rome, with Bernard by his side. Bernard, he himself declares, was constantly sighing for the quiet ^{Jan. 12.} shades of Clairvaux, for seclusion, for unworldly self-sanctification; but the interests of God and the commands of the Pope detained him, still reluctant, in the turmoil of secular affairs. His eloquence now wrought, perhaps, its greatest triumph; it prevailed over Roman faction and priestly ambition. Victor II., such was the name which the Cardinal-Priest Gregory had assumed with the Popedom, renounced his dignity; the powerful family of Peter the son of Leo abandoned the weary contest, and all Rome acknowledged the Pope of St. Bernard.

Never had Rome or any other city of Christendom beheld so numerous a council as that held by Innocent II. in the Lateran Palace on the 4th of April, 1139 — a thousand bishops (five from England), countless abbots, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. The decrees have survived, not the debates of this Council. The speech of the Pope may be read; there is no record of those of Bernard and of the other ruling authorities. But the decrees, as well as the speech of Innocent, image forth the Christianity of the times, the Christianity of St. Bernard.

The oration of the Pope is remarkable, as distinctly claiming a feudal superiority over the whole clergy of Christendom. Every ecclesiastical dignity is held of him, as the great spiritual liege lord.¹ After inveigh-

¹ "Quia a Romani pontificis licentia ecclesiastici ordinis celsitudo, quasi

ing against the sacrilegious ambition of the Antipope, Innocent annulled all his decrees. "We degrade all whom he has promoted; we expel from holy orders and depose all whom he has consecrated." Those ordained by the legate of Anacletus, Gerard of Angoulême, were interdicted from their functions. Each of these degraded Prelates was summoned. The Pope assailed those that appeared with indignant reproaches, wrenched their pastoral staves out of their hands, himself stripped the palls from their shoulders, and without mercy took away the rings by which they were wedded to their churches.

The decrees of the Lateran Council, while the Pope asserted his own unlimited power over the episcopal order, gave to the bishops the same unlimited power over the lower clergy.¹ Even for irregular or unbecoming dress they might be deprived of their benefices. The marriage of subdeacons was strictly forbidden. A remarkable statute inhibited the prevailing usage of monks and regular canons practising law and medicine; the law, as tending not merely to withdraw them from their proper occupation of psalmody, but as confounding their notions of right and wrong, of justice and iniquity, and encouraging them to be avaricious of worldly gain. The same avidity for lucre led them to practise medicine, the knowledge of which could not be reconciled with the severe modesty of a monk.

Another significant canon betrayed that already a secret insurrection was brooding in the hearts of men against the sacerdotal authority of the Church. These

feodalis juris consuetudine suscipitur, et sine ejus permissione legaliter non tenetur." — *Chronicon. Maurin, apud Labbe.*

¹ Decret. iv.

very times witnessed a formidable struggle against her wealth and power; and some bolder men had already begun to question her doctrines. The twenty-third canon of the Lateran Council might seem directed against the anabaptists of the 16th century. "We expel from the Church as heretics those who, under the semblance of religion, condemn the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the baptism of children, the priesthood, and the holy rite of marriage." The heretics against whom this anathema was aimed will before long force themselves on our notice.

The legislation of the Lateran Council did not confine itself to the affairs of the clergy, or, strictly speaking, of religion. The Council assumed the office of conservator of the public morals and the public peace. It condemned usurers and incendiaries. It repeated the enactment demanding security at all times for certain classes, the clergy of all orders, monks, pilgrims, merchants, and rustics employed in agriculture, with their beasts, their seed, and their flocks. The Truce of God was to be observed on the appointed days under peril of excommunication; after a third admonition excommunication followed, which if the clergy did not respect, they were to be degraded from their orders. The persons of the clergy were taken under especial protection. It was sacrilege to strike a clergyman or a monk—a sacrilege, the penalty of which could only be absolved on the death-bed. A rigid decree prohibited tournaments as a vain display of strength and valor, and as leading to bloodshed. Another singular decree condemned the use of the cross-bow against Christians and Catholics as an act deadly and hateful to God.

This solemn Christian protest against the habits of a warlike age, as might be expected, had no immediate or visible effect : yet still as a protest it may have worked in the depths of the Christian mind, if not absolutely compelling its observance, yet giving weight and authority to kindred thoughts in reflective minds ; at all events, rescuing Christianity from the imputation of a total forgetfulness of its genuine spirit, an utter extinction of its essential character.

In that strange discordance indeed which is so embarrassing in ecclesiastical history, almost all the few remaining years of Innocent II., the great pacificator, are occupied in war. He is heading his own armies, first against Tusculum and other rebellious cities in the neighborhood of Rome ; then in an obstinate war against the King of Sicily. It would be curious, if it were possible, to ascertain how far the papal troops respected the monk and the pilgrim, the merchant and the husbandman ; how far they observed the solemn days of the Truce of God. In these unseemly martial expeditions the popes were singularly unfortunate, yet their disasters almost always turned to their advantage. Like his predecessor Leo IX., Innocent fell, as a prisoner of war, into the hands of his enemies. Again the awe-struck Norman bowed before his holy captive ; and Innocent as a prisoner obtained better terms than he would have won at the point of the sword.

CHAPTER V.

GOTSCHALK — ABÉLARD.

THE papacy is again united in the person of Innocent II., but the work of the real Supreme Pontiff of Christendom, of the ruling mind of the West, is but half achieved. Bernard must be followed to other conquests, to other victories; victories which for some centuries left their influence upon mankind, and arrested the precocious, irregular, and perilous struggles for intellectual and spiritual, and even civil freedom.

Monastic Christianity led to two unexpected but inevitable results, to the expansion of the human understanding, even till it strove to overleap the lofty barriers of the established Catholic doctrine, and to a sullen and secret mutiny, at length to an open insurrection, against the power of the sacerdotal order. The former revolt was not only premature, but suppressed without any immediate outburst menacing to the stability of the dominant creed and institutions. It was confined not indeed to a few, for the schools of those whom the Church esteemed the most dangerous teachers were crowded with young and almost fanatical hearers. But it was a purely intellectual movement. The Church raised up on her side as expert and powerful dialecticians as those who strove for emancipation. Wherever philosophy aspired to be

Two great
intellectual
movements
begin.

independent of theology, it was seized and carried captive back. Nor did the Church by any means exclusively maintain her supremacy by stern and imperious authority, by proscribing and suppressing inquiry. Though she did not disdain, she did not entirely rely on fixing the infamy of heretical doctrine upon the more daring reasoners; she reasoned herself by her sons with equal vigor, if with more submissiveness; sounded with her antagonists the depths of metaphysical inquiry, examined the inexhaustible processes of human thought and language, till gradually the gigantic bulwark of scholastic theology rose around the Catholic doctrine.

Of this first movement, the intellectual struggle for emancipation, Abélard was the representative and the victim. Of the second, far more popular, immediate, and while it lasted, perilous, that which rose up against the whole hierarchical system of Christendom, the champion was Arnold of Brescia. This last was for a time successful; combining with the inextinguishable republican spirit of the Roman populace, it curbed and subjugated the great head of the hierarchy in the very seat of his power. It required a league between a powerful Emperor and an able Pope to crush Arnold of Brescia; but in the ashes of Arnold of Brescia's funeral pile smouldered for centuries the fire, which was at length to blaze out in irresistible violence.

Both these movements sprang naturally out of monastic Christianity; it is necessary to trace the birth of each in succession from this unsuspected and unsuspecting origin. It was impossible, even in the darkest times, to seclude a large part of mankind from the active duties of life without driving, as it were, some

into intellectual occupation. Conventual discipline might enslave or absorb the greater number by its perpetual round of ritual observance ; by the distribution of day and night into short portions, to each of which belonged its prayer, its maceration, its religious exercise. It might induce in most a religious terror, a fearful shrinking of the spirit from every possibly unlawful aberration of the mind, as from any unlawful emotion of the body. The coarser and more sluggish minds would be altogether ice-bound in the alternation of hard labor and unvarying religious service. They would rest contented in mechanical drudgery in the field, and as mechanical religion in the chapel. The calmer and more imaginative would surrender themselves to a dreamy ecstasy of devotion. Mysticism, in some one of its forms, would absorb all their energies of mind, all their aspirations of heart. Meditation with them might be one long, unbroken, unceasing adoration, the more indistinct the more awful, the more awful the more reverential ; and that reverence would suppress at once any question bordering on presumption. Submission to authority, the vital principle of monasticism, would be a part of their being. Yet with some contemplation could not but lead to thought ; meditation would quicken into reflection ; reflection, however checked by authority and restrained by dread, would still wander away, would still strive against its barriers. The being and the attributes of God, the first prescribed subject of holy contemplation, what were they ? Where was the bound, the distinction, between things visible and things invisible ? things material and things immaterial ? the real and the unreal ? the finite and the infinite ? The very object which was continually

enforced upon the mind by its most sublime attribute, the incomprehensibility of God, tempted the still baffled but unwearied desire of comprehension. Reason awoke, composed itself again to despairing slumber on the lap of authority; awoke again; its slumbers became more disturbed, more irregular, till the anodyne of awe had lost its power. Religion itself seemed to compel to metaphysical inquiry; and the region of metaphysical inquiry once expanding on the view, there was no retreat. Reason no sooner began to cope with these inevitable subjects, than it was met on the threshold by the great question, the existence of a world inapprehensible by our senses, and that of the mode of its apprehension by the mind. This great unanswerable problem appears destined to endure as long as mankind; but no sooner was it started and followed out by the contemplative monk, than from an humble disciple of the Gospel he became a philosopher; he was, perhaps, an unconscious Aristotelian, or an unconscious Platonist. But in truth the tradition of neither philosophy had absolutely died out. Among the few secular books which survived the wreck of learning and found their way into the monastic libraries, were some which might foster the bias either to the more rational or more ideal view.¹

So in every insurrection, whether religious or more philosophical, against the dominant dogmatic system, a monk was the leader, and there had been three or four of these insurrections before the time of Abélard. Even early in the ninth century the German monk Gotschalk had revived the dark subject of predestination. This subject had almost slept since the time of Augustine

¹ The *Isagoge* of Porphyrius; the works of Boethius.

and his scholar Fulgentius, who had relentlessly crushed the Semi-Pelagianism of his day.¹ It is a singular circumstance, as has been before shown, that this religious fatalism has been so constantly the creed or rather the moving principle of those who have risen up against established ecclesiastical authority, while an established religion tends constantly to acquiesce in a less inflexible view of divine providence. The reason is simple and twofold. Nothing less than a stern fanaticism, which makes the reformer believe himself under the direct guidance, a mere instrument, predestined by God's providence for this work, would give courage to confront a powerful hierarchy, to meet obloquy, persecution, even martyrdom; the same fanaticism, by awakening a kindred conviction of an absolute and immediate call from God, gives hope of a successful struggle at least, if not of victory; he is pre-doomed or specially commissioned and avowed by the Most High. On the other hand an hierarchy is naturally averse to a theory which involves the direct and immediate operation of God by an irreversible decree upon each individual mind. Assuming itself to be the intermediate agency between God and man, and resistance to its agency being the sure and undeniable consequence of the tenet, it cannot but wish to modify or mitigate that predestination which it does not altogether reject. It is perpetually appealing to the free-will of man by its offers of the means of grace; as the guide and spiritual director of each individual soul, it will not be superseded

¹ It is curious that the first heresy, after the *establishment* of Mohammedanism, was the denial, or questioning at least, of predestinarianism. "A peine le prophète était mort qu'une dispute s'éleva entre les théologiens sur le dogme de Prédestination." — Schmolder's *Essai*, p. 192. See also Ritter, *Christliche Philosophie*, p. 693.

by an anterior and irrevocable law. Predestination, in its extreme theory at least, disdains all the long, slow, and elaborate work of the Church, in training, watching, controlling, and submitting to ecclesiastical discipline, the soul committed to its charge. The predestinarian, though in fact (such is the logical inconsistency of strong religious belief) by no means generally antinomian, is always represented and indeed believed to be antinomian by those from whose rigid authority this primary tenet emancipates the disciple. So it was that the Transalpine hierarchy, under the ruling influence of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who at one time possessed almost papal authority, persecuted the Predestinarian as a dangerous and lawless heretic; and Gotschalk endured the censure of a council, the scourge, the prison, with stubborn and determined confidence, not merely that he was fulfilling his divine mission, but that in him the Church condemned the true doctrine of the irrefragable Augustine.¹

Hincmar called to his aid, against this premature Luther, an ally who alarmed the Church no less than Gotschalk himself by his appeal to a new power above Catholic authority, human reason. We have already encountered this extraordinary

Scotus
Erigena.

¹ Gotschalk stands so much alone, that I thought it not necessary, during the age of Hincmar, to arrest the course of events by the discussion of his views. His tenets may be seen in one sentence from his own works in Hincmar's *De Prædestinatione*: "Quia sicut Deus incommutabilis ante mundi constitutionem omnes electos suos incommutabiliter per gratuitam gratiam suam prædestinavit ad vitam æternam, similiter omnino omnes reprobos, qui in die judicii damnabuntur propter ipsorum mala merita, idem ipse incommutabilis Deus per justum judicium suum incommutabiliter prædestinavit ad mortem merito sempiternam." In Archbishop Usher's works will be found the whole controversy. — *Gotteschalci et Prædestinariarum Controversiæ ab eo motæ Historia*. See also the *Lectures of M. Ampère*.

man as the spiritual ancestor, the parent of Berengar of Tours and of his anti-transubstantiation doctrine. A sudden revulsion took place. Hincmar, by his overweening pride and pretensions to supremacy, at least over the whole Church of France, had awakened a strong jealousy among the great prelates of the realm. Prudentius of Troyes took the lead against him; and though eventually Gotschalk died in a prison, yet Hincmar became a tyrannical persecutor, wellnigh a heretic, Gotschalk an injured victim, if not a martyr. This fatal ally of Hincmar was the famous John, commonly called Erigena.

Perhaps the only fact which may be considered certain as to the early years of John the Erin-born is, that he must have commenced at least this train of philosophic thought in some one of the monastic schools of Ireland or of the Scottish islands. In some secluded monastery among those last retreats of knowledge which had escaped the Teutonic invasion, or on the wave-beat shore of Iona, John the Scot imbibed that passion for knowledge which made him an acceptable guest at Paris, the partner of the table and even of the bed of Charles the Bald.¹ Throughout those wild and turbulent times of Charles the Bald Erigena lived undisturbed by the civil wars which raged around, resolutely detached from secular affairs, not in monastic but in intellectual seclusion. John is said to have made a pilgrimage, not to the birthplace of the Saviour, but to that of Plato and Aristotle;² and it is difficult to

¹ Hence the anecdote, true or false, of his famous repartee to the King, "*Quid distat inter Scotum et sotum?—mensa.*"

² Brucker thinks that John's knowledge of Greek gave rise to this report of his travels to the East.

imagine where in the West he can have obtained such knowledge of Greek as to enable him to translate the difficult and mystic work which bore the name of Dionysius the Areopagite.¹ John the Scot professed an equal admiration for the antagonistic philosophies of Plato and of Aristotle; he even attempted the yet unaccomplished, perhaps the impossible, task of reconciling the poetry and prose of the two systems. In his treatise on Predestination he boldly asserts the supremacy of Reason; he throws off, what no Latin before had dared, the fetters of Augustinianism. His free-will is even more than the plain practical doctrine of Chrysostom and the Greek Fathers, who avoided or eluded that inscrutable question: it is an attempt to found it on philosophic grounds, to establish it on the sublime arbitration of human reason. In his translation of Dionysius the Areopagite with the Commentary of Maximus, Erigena taught the mysticism of the later Platonists. He aspired to the still higher office of harmonizing philosophy with religion, which in their loftiest sense he declared to be the same.² Thus John the Scot was at once a strong Ration-

¹ Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, himself a Greek, had given a temporary impulse to the study of the language. It will be seen that two centuries later the universal Abélard was ignorant of Greek; and I doubt whether his fair pupil understood more than her master.

² Erigena's most remarkable work bears a Greek title, *περὶ φύσεως υπερσυστοιχίας*, published by Gale, Oxford, 1681; recently by M. Schruter, Munster, 1838. On this book compare Haureau, *De la Philosophie Scholastique* (an admirable treatise), p. 112, *et seq.* "Quel étonnement, disons même quel respect, doit nous inspirer la grande figure de ce docteur, qui causera tant d'agitation dans l'école, dans l'Eglise; qui semera les vents, et recueillera les tempêtes, mais saura les braver; qui ne laissera pas un héritier direct de sa doctrine, mais qui du moins aura la gloire d'avoir annoncé, d'avoir précédé Bruno, Vanini, Spinoza, les plus téméraires des logiciens qui aient jamais erré sous les platanes de l'Académie." See also the Lectures of M. Ampère.

alist (he brings all theologic questions to the test of dialectic reasoning); and at the same time, not by remote inference, but plainly and manifestly a Pantheist. With him God is all things, all things are God. The Creator alone truly *is*; the universe is but a sublime Theophany, a visible manifestation of God. He distinctly asserts the eternity of the universe; his dialectic proof of this he proclaims to be irresistible. Creation could not have been an accident of the Deity; it is of his essence to be a cause: all things therefore have existed, do exist, and will exist through him their cause. All things flow from the infinite abyss of the Godhead, and are reabsorbed into it.¹ No wonder that, notwithstanding the profound devotion which John the Scot blended with his most daring speculations, and the valuable service which he rendered to the Church, especially by his confutation, on however perilous grounds, yet which the foes of the predestinarian alleged to be a full confutation of the predestinarian Gotschalk, he was met by a loud and hostile clamor. Under the general denunciation of the Church and of the Pope, Nicolas I., he was obliged to fly to England: there he is said to have taken refuge in Alfred's new University of Oxford.² But if by his bolder speculations John the Scot appalled his age, by his

¹ Compare Brucker, vol. iii. p. 618, Schmidt der *Mysticismus der Mittel Alter*. See also Guizot, *Civilis. Moderne*, Lec. 29; Rousselot, *Etudes sur la Philosophie dans le Moyen Age*, cap. 2. John Scot had in distinct terms the "*cogito, ergo sum*" of Descartes; but in fact he took it from Augustine. — Haureau, p. 133. Compare Ritter, ii. p. 186. We may return to John Scot.

² The account of his death is borrowed by Matthew of Westminster from that of a later John the Saxon, who was stabbed by some monks in a quarrel. The flight to England does not depend on the truth of that story

translation of Dionysius the Areopagite he compensated to the monastic system as supplying to the dreamy and meditative a less lawless and more absorbing train of thought, a more complete, more satisfactory, yet inoffensive mysticism to the restless mind.¹ What could be more congenial to the recluse, who aspired beyond the daily routine of toil and psalmody, than this vision of the Godhead, this mystic union with the Supreme, the emancipation of the soul from its corporal prison-house, the aspiration to, the absorption in, the primal fountain of light and blessedness, the attainable angelic, and higher than angelic perfection, the ascent through all the gradations of the celestial hierarchy up to the visible at once and invisible throne of God? The effect of this work on the whole ecclesiastic system, and on the popular faith, it is almost impossible justly to estimate. The Church of France had now made it a point of their national and monastic honor to identify the St. Denys, the founder and patron saint of the church at Paris, with the Areopagite of St. Paul; to them there could be no gift so acceptable, none so greedily received. But when the whole hierarchy found that they, each in their ascending order, were the image of an ascending hierarchical type in heaven; that each order, culminating in the Pope,² was the representative of a celestial order culminating in the Supreme; this was too flattering to their pride and to their power not to become at once orthodox and ecclesiastical doctrine. The effect of this new angel-

¹ William of Malmesbury says of Erigena: "*Si tamen ignoscatur ei in aliquibus, in quibus a Latinorum tramite deviavit, dum in Græcos acriter oculos intendit.*" — P. 190, N. S. edit.

² See, however, vol. vi. This tenet would be added in the West

ology on the popular belief, on the arts, and on the imagination of Latin Christendom, will be more fully developed in our consideration of the rise and progress of Christian mythology.

Though an outcast and an exile, John the Scot maintained such authority on account of his transcendent learning, that in the second great rebellion, not merely against the supremacy but almost the life of the mediæval system, Berengar of Tours appealed to him as one whose name, whose intimacy with Charles the Bald, ought to overawe the puny opponents of his time. He seems to have thought, he fearlessly and repeatedly asserted even so learned and renowned a prelate as Lanfranc to be presumptuous in not bowing at once to the decisions of John the Scot.

As time rolled on, these speculations were no longer working only in the minds of solitary men, often no doubt when least suspected. They were not promulgated, as those of Gotschalk had been, by public preaching; even those of Berengar had gained their full publicity in the schools which were attached to many of the greater monasteries. In these schools, the parents of our modern universities, the thought which had been brooded over, and perhaps suppressed in the silence of the cloister, found an opportunity of suggesting itself for discussion, of commanding a willing, often a numerous, auditory; and was quickened by the collision of adverse opinion. The recluse and meditative philosopher became a teacher, the head of a new philosophy. Dialectics, the science of logic, was one of the highest, if not the highest, intellectual study. It was part of the Quadrivium, the more advanced and perfect stage of public education; and under the

specious form of dialectic exercises, the gravest questions of divinity became subjects of debate. Thus began to rise a new Christian theology; not that of the Church embodied in the devout forms of the Liturgy, and enforced in the simple or more impassioned discourse from the pulpit; not that of the thoughtful divine, following out his own speculations in their natural course; but that of the disputant, bound by conventional scientific forms, with a tendency to degenerate from a severe investigation of truth into a trial of technical skill. In its highest tone acute, ingenious, and subtile, it presented every question in every possible form; it was comprehensive so as to embrace the most puerile and frivolous as well as the most momentous and majestic inquiries; if dry, wearisome, unawakening in its form, as litigation and as a strife of contending minds, it became of intense interest. It was the intellectual tournament of a small intellectual aristocracy, to which all the scholars who were bred to more peaceful avocations thronged in multitudes.

The strife between the Nominalists and Realists, famous names, which to the schools were as the Guelfs and Ghibellines in the politics of Europe, was one of the first inevitable results of this importance assumed by the science of dialectics. It is difficult to translate this controversy out of its logical language, and to make it clearly intelligible to the popular apprehension; nor is it immediately apparent how the fundamental truths of Christianity, of religion itself, as the jealous and sensitive vigilance of the hierarchy could not but perceive, were involved in this dispute. The doctrine and fate of Roscelin, the first great Nominalist, the authoritative interpreter if not the author of the system,

show at once the character and the fears excited by Nominalism. Roscelin peremptorily denied the real existence of universals; nothing actually *is* but the individual, that of which the senses take immediate cognizance. Universals were mere conventional phrases. Each animal subsists; the animal race is but an aggregate of the thought; man lives, humankind is a creation of the mind; the inherent, distinctive, accidental qualities of things are inseparable from the objects to which they belong. He even denied the proper existence of parts, the whole alone had actual being; it was divided or analyzed only by an effort of reflection. Though the materializing tendency of Roscelin's doctrine was clearly discerned¹ and sternly denounced by his adversaries, yet Roscelin himself did not absolutely deny the reality of the invisible, immaterial world: the souls of men, the angels, the Deity, were to him unquestioned beings. This appears even from the fatal syllogism which awoke the jealousy of the Church, and led to the proscription of Roscelin. For philosophy could not stand aloof from theology, and Roscelin was too bold or too consistent not to push his system into that forbidden domain. The statement of his opinions rests on the evidence of his adversary, but that adversary, Anselm, cites his own words, and in a form likely to have been used by so fearless a dialectician. While he reasoned of the Godhead as if having no doubt of its real being, his own concessions seemed of necessity to perplex or to destroy the doctrine of the Trinity.

¹ "In eorum (the Nominalists) quippe animabus, ratio, quæ et princeps et iudex omnium debet esse quæ sunt in homine, sic est in imaginationibus corporalibus obvoluta, ut ex eis se non possit evolvere; nec ab ipsis ea quæ ipsa sola et pura contemplari debet, valeat discernere." — Anselm, apud Rousselot.

If the three persons are one thing and not three things, as distinct as three angels or three souls, though one in will and power, the Father and the Holy Ghost must have been incarnate with the Son.¹

It was a churchman, but a churchman bred in a monastery, who in the quiet of its cloisters had long sounded the depths of metaphysical inquiry and was practised in its schools, one really compelled to leave his contemplative seclusion to mingle in worldly affairs — Anselm, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who rose up to denounce and confute at once the heretical logic and heretical theology of Roscelin.

The Norman abbey of Bec seemed to aspire to that same preëminence in theologic learning and the accomplishments of high-minded churchmen which the Normans were displaying in valor, military skill, and the conquests of kingdoms. The Normans had founded or subdued great monarchies at each extreme of Europe. Normans sat on the thrones of Sicily and England. From the Norman abbey of Bec came forth two archbishops of England, the champions of the Catholic doctrine, one, Lanfranc, against Berengar of Tours, the other, Anselm, the triumphant adversary of Roscelin, and, if not the founder, the precursor of the scholastic theology. The monastery of Bec had been founded by Herluin, a fierce and ignorant knight, who toiled and prayed as a monk with the same vehemence with which he had fought as a warrior. Herluin, accustomed to head a band of savage

The abbey
of Bec.

¹ "Si in Deo tres personæ sunt una tantum res, et non sunt tres res, unaquæque per se separatim, sicut tres angeli, aut tres animæ, ita tamen ut voluntate et potentiâ sint idem, ergo Pater et Spiritus Sanctus cum Filio incarnatus est." — Anselm de fid. Trinit., Rousselot, t. i. p. 160.

freebooters, suddenly seized with a paroxysm of devotion, had become the head of a religious brotherhood, in which the no less savage austerity made a profound impression upon his countrymen, and obtained for it that fame for rigid discipline which led the Italian Lanfranc, as afterwards the Italian Anselm, to its walls.¹ It is true that the great theologians of Bec were strangers by birth, but they were adopted Normans, called to Norman sees, and protected by Norman kings.

The profound devotion of his age was the all-absorbing passion of Anselm.² The monastery was Anselm's home; when he was forced into the Primate's throne of England, his heart was still in the quiet abbey of Bec. In his philosophy, as in his character, Faith was the priest, who stood alone in the sanctuary of his heart; Reason, the awe-struck and reverential minister was to seek satisfaction not for the doubts (for from doubts Anselm would have recoiled as from treason against God), but for those grave questionings, how far and in what manner the harmony was to be established between the Godhead of Revelation and of Reason. The theology of the Church, in all its most imperious dogmatism, was the irrefragable truth from which Anselm set out. It was not timidity, or even awe, which kept him within the barriers; his mind intuitively shrunk from all without those bounds, excepting so far as profound thought might seem to elucidate and make

¹ Compare throughout C. Rémusat, *Anselme*. This excellent book has appeared since the greater part of my work was written: the whole indeed of this passage. See also the treatises of Anselm, many of them separately republished; Frank, *Anselm von Canterbury*; Möhler, *Anselm*; Bouchette.

² Anselm will appear again in his high sacerdotal character as Archbishop of Canterbury.

more clear the catholic conceptions of the Godhead and of the whole invisible world. His famous philosophical axiom, which alone perpetuated his renown during the centuries which looked with contempt on the intellectual movements of the middle ages, the a priori proof of the being of God — “The idea of God in the mind of man is the one unanswerable evidence of the existence of God” — this with Anselm was an illustration rather than the groundwork of his theology. It was not the discovery of God, whom his soul had from its earliest dawn implicitly believed, whom his heart had from his youth upward loved with intense devotion; it was not even a satisfaction of his craving intellect (his intellect required no satisfaction); it was the bright thought which flashed across the reflective mind, or to which it was led by the slow gradations of reasoning.¹ Faith condescended to knowledge, not because faith was insufficient, but because knowledge was, as it were, in the contemplative mind a necessary fruit of faith. He could not understand unless he first believed. But the intellect, which had for so many centuries slumbered on the lap of religion, or at least only aspired to activity on subjects far below these primary and elemental truths; which when it fought, fought for the outworks of the creed, and left the citadel, or rather (for, as in Jerusalem, the Temple was the fortress as well as the fane) the Holy of Holies, to be guarded by its own inherent sanctity; — the intellect however awakened with reverential hand, once stirred, could not compose

¹ “Neque enim quæro intelligere, ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam. Nam et hoc credo, quia nisi credidero, non intelligam.” — Prolog., c. iv. “Gratias tibi, bone Domine, gratias tibi: quia quod prius credidi te ducente; jam sic intelligo te illuminante, ut si te esse nolim credere, non possem non intelligere.”

itself to the same profound repose. Anselm unconsciously, being absolutely himself without fear and without danger, had entered ; and if he did not first throw open, had expanded wide the doors of that region of metaphysical inquiry which others would hereafter tread with bolder steps. Questions which he touched with holy dread were soon to be vexed by ruder hands. Reason had received an admission which, however timidly, she would never cease to assert.

It may appear at first singular that the thought which suggested itself to the mind of a monk at Bec should still be the problem of metaphysical theology ; and theology must, when followed out, become metaphysical ; metaphysics must become theological. This same thought seems, with no knowledge of its mediæval origin, to have forced itself on Descartes, was reasserted by Leibnitz, if not rejected was thought insufficient by Kant, revived in another form by Schelling and by Hegel ; latterly has been discussed with singular fulness and ingenuity by M. de Rémusat. Yet will it less surprise the more profoundly reflective, who cannot but perceive how soon and how inevitably the mind arrives at the verge of human thought ; how it cannot but encounter this same question, which in another form divided in either avowed or unconscious antagonism, Plato and Aristotle, Anselm and his opponents (for opponents he had of no common subtilty), Leibnitz and Locke ; which Kant failed to reconcile ; which his followers have perhaps bewildered by a new and intricate phraseology more than elucidated ; which modern eclecticism harmonizes rather in seeming than in reality ; the question of questions ; our primary, elemental, it may be innate or instinctive, or acquired

and traditional, idea, conception, notion, conviction of God, of the Immaterial, the Eternal, the Infinite.

Anselm, at first by his secluded monastic habits, afterwards on account of his dignity as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the part which he was compelled to take in the quarrel about investitures in England, either shrunk from or stood above the personal conflicts which involved other metaphysicians in active hostilities. Yet, however the schools might already have been startled by theories of alarming import (the more alarming, since few could foresee their ultimate end), so far, without doubt, in all these conflicts between the intellectual and religious development of man, in these first insurrections against the autocracy of the Church, as regards its power over the public mind, the Church had come forth triumphant. Its adversaries had been awed, it might be into sullen and reluctant silence, yet into silence. Even in the strife between Abélard and St. Bernard it seemed to maintain the same superiority.

The life of Abélard, contrasted with that of St. Bernard, gives, as it were, the full measure and perfect image of the time in its intellectual as in its religious development.

Peter Abélard was a Breton (a native of Palais, about four leagues from Nantes). In him were centred the characteristics of that race,¹ the uncontrollable impetuosity, the individuality, which delighted in isolation from the rest of mankind, the

Abélard born
A.D. 1079.

¹ On Abélard, see above all his own works (the first volume of a new edition has appeared, by M. Cousin), more especially the *Historia Calamitatum* and the *Letters*. The *Sic et Non* edited, with reservations, by M. Cousin; more completely by Henke. — Rousselot, *Etudes*; C. de Rémusat, *Abélard*

self-confidence which swelled into arrogance, the perseverance which hardened into obstinacy, the quickness and fertility which were speedily fostered into a passion for disputation. His education ripened with unexampled rapidity his natural character; no man is so overbearing or so stubborn as a successful disputant; and very early in life Abélard became the most powerful combatant in the intellectual tilting matches of the schools, which had now become one of the great fashions of the day. His own words show the singular analogy between the two paths of distinction open to aspiring youth. "I preferred," said Abélard, "the strife of disputations to the trophies of war." Skill in dialectics became to the young churchman what the management of the lance and of the courser was to the knight. He descended into the lists, and challenged all comers; and those lists, in the peaceful conventual schools, were watched with almost as absorbing interest by spectators hardly less numerous. Before the age of twenty Abélard had wandered through great part of France as an errant logician, and had found no combatant who could resist his prowess. He arrived in Paris, where the celebrated William of Cham-^{About}
peaux was at the height of his fame. The ^{A.D. 1100.} schools of Paris, which afterwards expanded into that renowned University, trembled at the temerity of the youth who dared to encounter that veteran in dialectic warfare, whose shield had been so long untouched, and who had seemed secure in his all-acknowledged puissance. Abélard in a short time was the pupil, the rival, the conqueror, and of course an object of implacable animosity to the vanquished chieftain of the schools. To have been the master of Abélard might

seem, indeed, to insure his rebellion. He seized at once on the weak parts of his teacher's system, and in his pride of strength scrupled not to trample him in the dust. Abélard had once been the pupil of Roscelin; he denounced, refuted Nominalism. He was now the hearer of William of Champeaux; the peculiar Realism which William taught met with no more respect. Notwithstanding the opposition of his master, he set up a rival school, first, under the favor of the Court, at Melun, afterwards at Corbeil, nearer Paris. A domestic affliction, the death of his beloved mother, sent him back to Brittany, where he remained some short time. On his return he renewed the attempt to dethrone William of Champeaux, and succeeded in drawing off all his scholars. The philosopher, in disgust at his empty hall, retired into a brotherhood of black canons. Abélard assumed his chair. The Court interest, and perhaps the violence of some older and still faithful disciples of William of Champeaux, expelled him from his usurped seat. He retired again to Melun, and reëstablished his rival school. But on the final retirement of William of Champeaux from Paris, Abélard returned to the city; and notwithstanding that William himself came back to support his appointed successor, a general desertion of his pupils left Abélard in undisputed supremacy. William of Champeaux was consoled for his discomfiture by the Bishopric of Châlons.

But there was one field alone for the full, complete, and commanding development of dialectic skill, which had now to a certain extent drawn itself apart into a distinct and separate camp: philosophy was no longer, as with Anselm, one with divinity. That field was

theology. This was the single, all-engrossing subject, which the disputant could not avoid, Abélard a theologian. and which alone, through the Church or the monastery, led to permanent fame, repose, wealth, or power. As yet Abélard had kept prudently aloof, as far as was possible, from that sacred and uncongenial domain. For Abélard had no deep devotional training, no severe discipline, no habits of submission. He might aspire remotely to the dignity, honor, or riches of the churchman, but he had nothing of the hierarchical spirit, no reverence for rigid dogmatic orthodoxy; he stood alone in his conscious strength, consorted not intimately with the ecclesiastics, espoused not ostentatiously their interests, perhaps betrayed contempt of their ignorance. Of the monk he had still less; whatever love of solitude he might indulge, was that of philosophic contemplation, not of religious or mystic meditation. His place in the convent was not the chapel at midnight or before the break of morning; his was not either the richly-intoned voice swelling the full harmony of the choir, or the tender orison of the humble and weeping penitent. Of his fasts, of his mortifications, of his self-torture, nothing is heard. His place is in the adjacent school, where he is perplexing his antagonists with his dexterous logic, or losing them with himself in the depths of his subtle metaphysics. Yet the fame at least of theologic erudition is necessary to crown his glory; he must be profoundly learned, as well as irresistibly argumentative. He went to Laon to study under Anselm, the most renowned theologian of his day. The fame of this Anselm survives only in the history of Abélard — lost, perhaps, in that of his greater namesake, now dead for many years. With

more than his characteristic temerity and arrogance, he treated Anselm even less respectfully than he had treated William of Champeaux. He openly declared the venerable divine to owe his fame to his age rather than to his ability or knowledge. Abélard began at once to lecture in opposition to his master on the Prophet Ezekiel. His renown was now at its height ; there was no branch of knowledge on which Abélard did not believe himself, and was not believed, competent to give the fullest instruction. Not merely did all Paris and the adjacent districts throng to his school, but there was no country so remote, no road so difficult, but that the pupils defied the toils and perils of the way. From barbarous Anjou, from Poitou, Gascony, and Spain, from Normandy, Flanders, Germany, Swabia, from England notwithstanding the terrors of the sea, scholars of all ranks and classes crowded to Paris. Even Rome, the great teacher of the world in all arts and sciences, acknowledged the superior wisdom of Abélard, and sent her sons to submit to his discipline.

The romance of Abélard's life commenced when it
Heloisa. usually begins to languish in others ; that romance, so singularly displaying the manners, habits, and opinions of the time, becomes grave history. He was nearer forty than thirty when the passions of youth, which had hitherto been controlled by habits of severe study, came upon him with sudden and unresisted violence. No religious scruples seem to have interposed. The great philosopher, though as yet only an ecclesiastic in dignity, and destined for the sacred function, a canon of the Church, calmly determines to reward himself for his long continence. Yet his fastidious feelings

loathed the more gross and vulgar sensualities. His studies had kept him aloof from the society of high-born ladies ; yet, as he asserts, and as Heloisa in the fervor of her admiration scruples not to confirm his assertion, there was no female, however noble in birth or rank, or spotless in fame, who would have scrupled to receive the homage and reward the love of Abélard. Though Abélard was looking out, like a gallant knight, for a mistress of his affections, there was nothing chivalrous or reverential in his passion for Heloisa. He deliberately planned the seduction of this maiden, who was no less distinguished for her surpassing beauty than for her wonderful talents and knowledge. He offered to board in the house of her uncle, the Canon Fulbert, in order that he might cultivate to the utmost the mind of this accomplished damsel. The avarice and vanity of the uncle were equally tempted ; without suspicion he made over his niece to the absolute authority of the teacher, permitting him even to inflict personal chastisement.

Abélard's new passion only developed more fully his wonderful faculties. The philosopher and theologian became a poet and a musician. The lovers made no attempt at the concealment of their mutual attachment. All Paris admired the beautiful amatory verses of Abélard, which were allowed to transpire ; and Heloisa, in the deep devotion of her love, instead of shrinking from the breath of public fame, thought herself an object of envy to all her sex. The Canon Fulbert alone was ignorant that he had intrusted, in Abélard's own words, " his spotless lamb to a ravening wolf." When the knowledge was at last forced upon

him, Heloisa fled with her lover in the disguise of a nun, and in the house of his sister in Brittany, gave birth to a son, whom he called by the philosophic name of Astrolabius.¹ The indignant Canon insisted on the reparation of his family honor by marriage. Abélard consented; Heloisa alone, in an absolute, unrivalled spirit of self-devotion, so wonderful that we forget to reprove, resisted; she used every argument, every appeal to the pride, the honor, even to the love of Abélard, which are usually urged to enforce that atonement, to dissuade her lover from a step so fatal to his fame and his advancement. As a philosopher Abélard would be trammelled by the vulgar cares of a family; as a churchman his career of advancement, which might soar to the highest place, was checked at once and forever. Moral impediments might be got over, canonical objections were insuperable; he might stand above all but the inexorable laws of the Church through his transcendent abilities. Though she had been, though she might be still his mistress, she did not thereby incapacitate him for any high dignity; as his wife she closed against him that ascending ladder of ecclesiastical honors, the priorate, the abbacy, the bishopric, the metropolitanate, the cardinalate, and even that which was beyond and above all. There was no place to which Abélard, as her heart and mind assured her the first of men, might not reasonably, rightfully aspire, and was

¹ M. Cousin (*Nouveaux Fragments Philosophiques*, vol. ii.) has published a long Latin poem addressed to his son by Abélard. It is in part a versification of the Book of Proverbs. Of the life of Astrolabius nothing is known. M. Cousin found this singular name in the list of the abbots of a monastery in Switzerland, of a date which agrees with the age of Abélard's son.

his Heloisa to stand in his way?¹ These were the arguments of Heloisa herself: this is a heroism of self-abnegation incredible in any but a deeply-loving woman; and even in her so rare as to be matter of astonishment.

The fears or the remorse of Abélard were stronger than the reasonings of Heloisa. He endeavored to appease the injured uncle by a secret marriage, which took place at Paris. But the secret was soon divulged by the wounded pride and the vanity of Fulbert. Heloisa, still faithful to her lover's least wishes and interests, denied the marriage; and Abélard removed her to the nunnery of Argenteuil. There, in all but taking the veil and in receiving his stolen visits, which did not respect the sanctity of the place, her sweetness, her patience, her piety, her conformity to all the rules, won her the universal respect and esteem.

Fulbert still suspected, he might well suspect, that Abélard intended to compel his wife to take the veil, and so release him from the ties of wedlock. His revenge was that of the most exquisite and ingenious malice, as well as of the most inhuman cruelty. It aimed at blasting the ambition, as well as punishing the lust of its victim. By his mutilation (for Mutilation. A.D. 1119. in this respect the canon law strictly followed

¹ Her whole soul is expressed in the quotation from Lucan, uttered, it is said, when she entered the cloister at Argenteuil: —

“O maxime conjux!

O thalamis indigne meis. Hoc juris habebat
In tantum fortuna caput? Cur impia nupsi;
Si miserum factura fui? Nunc accipe pœnas,
Sed quas sponte luam.”

Noble, but not nunlike lines!

that of Leviticus) Abélard might, he thought, be forever disqualified from ecclesiastical honors. The punishment of Abélard's barbarous enemies, of Fulbert and his accomplices, which was demanded by the public voice, and inflicted by the civil power, could not console; the general commiseration could only aggravate his misery and despair. He threw himself, at first determined to shun the sight of the world, into the monastery of St. Denys; Heloisa, still passive to his commands, took the veil at Argenteuil. But even to the end the fervent affections of Heloisa were hardly transferred to holier and more spiritual objects; religion, when it became a passion, might soften, it could not efface from her heart, that towards Abélard.

The fame of Abélard, and his pride and ungovernable soul, still pursued him; his talents retained their vigor; his temper was unsubdued. The monastery of St. Denys was dissolute. Abélard became a severe reformer; he rebuked the abbot and the whole community for their lax discipline, their unexemplary morals. He retired to a private cell, and near it opened a school. So great was the concourse of scholars, that lodging and provision could not be found for the countless throng. On the one side was an object of the most excessive admiration, on the other of the most implacable hatred. His enemies urged the bishop of the province to interdict his lectures, as tainted with secular learning unbecoming a monk. His disciples, with more dangerous adulation, demanded of the great teacher the satisfaction of their reason on the highest points of theology, which they could no longer receive in simple faith. They would no longer be blind leaders of the blind, nor pretend to believe what they did not

clearly comprehend.¹ Abélard composed a theological treatise, in which he discussed the awful mystery of the Trinity in Unity.

His enemies were on the watch. Two of his old discomfited antagonists at Laon, named Alberic Council of Soissons. A. D. 1121. and Litolf, denounced him before Rodolph Archbishop of Rheims, and Conon Bishop of Praneste, the Legate of the Pope. He was summoned to appear before a Council at Soissons. A rumor was spread abroad that he asserted that there were three Gods. He hardly escaped being stoned by the populace. But no one ventured to cope with the irresistible logician. Abélard offered his book; not a voice was raised to arraign it. The prudent and friendly Godfrey, Bishop of Chartres, demanded a fair hearing for Abélard; he was answered by a general cry that the whole world could not disentangle his sophisms. The council was drawing to a close. The enemies of Abélard persuaded the Archbishop and the Legate, who were unlettered men and weary of the whole debate, to command the book to be burned, and the author to be punished by seclusion in a monastery for his intolerable presumption in writing and lecturing on such subjects without the authority of the Pope and of the Church. This was a simple and summary proceeding. Abélard was compelled to throw his book into the fire with his own hands, and, weeping at the loss of his labors, to recite aloud the Athanasian creed. He was then sent, as to a prison, to the convent of St. Médard, but before long was permitted to return to his cell at St. Denys.

¹ "Nec credi posse aliquid, nisi primitus intellectum, et ridiculosum esse aliquem aliis prædicare, quod nec iose, nec illi quos doceret, intellectu capere." — Abélard, *Oper.*

His imprudent passion for truth plunged him in a new calamity. He ventured to question, from a passage in Bede, whether the patron saint of the abbey *St. Denys*. was indeed the Dionysius of St. Paul, the famous Areopagite. The monks had hardly endured his remonstrances against their dissolute lives; when he questioned the authenticity of their saint, their fury knew no bounds. They declared that Bede was an incorrigible liar, Abélard a sacrilegious heretic. Their founder had travelled in Greece, and brought home irrefragable proofs that their *St. Denys* was the convert of St. Paul. It was not the honor of the monastery alone which was now at stake, but that of the whole realm. Abélard was denounced as guilty of treasonable impiety against France by thus deposing her great tutelar saint. The vengeance of the King was invoked against him. Abélard fled. Both he and the prior of a monastery near Troyes, who was so rash as to be one of his believers, were threatened with excommunication. The blow so shocked the Abbot of *St. Denys* (he was said indeed to have broken his constitution by intemperance) that he died, and thus relieved Abélard from one of his most obstinate and bitter enemies. The Court was appeased, and through the royal interest, Abélard was permitted to withdraw to a more peaceful solitude.

After some delay Abélard availed himself of the royal permission; he found a wild retreat, near the small river *Ardrissan*, not far from Troyes. There, like the hermits of old, he built his solitary cabin of osiers and of thatch. But the sanctity of Antony or of Benedict, or of the recent founder of the Cistercian order, was not more attractive than the cell of the phi-

osopher. Abélard, thus degraded in the eyes of men and in his own estimation by his immorality and by its punishment, branded with the suspicion of heresy by a council of the Church, with a reputation for arrogance and an intractable temper, which brought discord wherever he went, an outcast of society rather than a world-wearied anchorite, had nevertheless lost none of his influence. The desert was peopled around him by his admiring scholars; they left the castle and the city to dwell in the wilderness; for their lofty palaces they built lowly hovels; for their delicate viands they fed on bread and wild herbs; instead of soft beds they reposed contentedly on straw and chaff. Abélard proudly adapted to himself the words of Scripture, "Behold, the whole world is gone after him; by our persecution we have prevailed nothing, we have but increased his glory." A monastery arose, which had hardly space in its cells for the crowding votaries; ^{A.D. 1122,} ^{1125.} Abélard called it by the name of the Paraclete — a name which, for its novelty and seeming presumption, gave new offence to his multiplying enemies.¹

But it was not the personal hatred alone which Abélard had excited by his haughty tone and vituperative language, or even by his daring criticism of old legends. His whole system of teaching, the foundation, and discipline, and studies, in the Paraclete, could not but be looked upon with alarm and suspicion. This new philosophic community, a community at least bound together by no religious vow and governed by ^{The Para-} ^{clete.} no rigid monastic rules, in which the profoundest and most awful mysteries of religion were freely discussed, in which the exercises were those of the school

¹ Opp. Abélard, Epist. i. p. 28.

rather than of the cloister, and dialectic disputations rather than gloomy ascetic practices the occupation, awoke the vigilant jealousy of the two great reformers of the age, Norbert, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, whose great achievement had been the subjection of the regular canons to a severer rule, and Bernard whose abbey of Clairvaux was the model of the most rigorous, most profoundly religious monastic life. The founder of the Paraclete was at least a formidable rival, if not a dangerous antagonist. Abélard afterwards scornfully designated these two adversaries as the new apostles; but they were the apostles of the ancient established faith, himself that of the new school, the heresy, not less fearful because undefinable, of free inquiry. Neither Norbert nor Bernard probably comprehended the full tendency of this premature intellectual movement, but they had an instinctive apprehension of its antagonism to their own power and influence, as well as to the whole religious system, which had now full possession of the human mind. There was as yet no declaration of war, no direct accusation, no summons to answer specific charges before council or legate; but that worse hostility of secret murmurs, of vague suspicions spread throughout Christendom, of solemn warnings, of suggested fears. Abélard, in all his pride, felt that he stood alone, an object of universal suspicion; he could not defend himself against this unseen, unaggressive warfare; he was as a man reported to be smitten with the plague, from whom the sound and healthy shrunk with an instinctive dread, and who had no power of forcing an examination of his case. His overweening haughtiness broke down into overweening dejection. He was so miserable that in his despair he

thought seriously of taking refuge beyond the borders of Christendom, of seeking elsewhere that quiet which was refused him by Christian hostility, to live as a Christian among the declared foes of Christianity.¹

Whether from personal respect, or the national pride of the Bretons in their distinguished countryman, he was offered the dignity of Abbot in a monastery on the coast of Brittany in Morbihan, that of St. Gildas de Rhuys. It was a bleak and desolate region, the monks as rude and savage as the people, even the language was unknown to Abélard. There, on the very verge of the world, on the shores of the ocean, Abélard sought in vain for quiet. The monks were as lawless in life as in manners; there was no common fund, yet Abélard was expected to maintain the buildings and religious services of the community. Each monk spent his private property on his wife or his concubine. Abélard, always in extremes, endeavored to submit this rugged brotherhood to the discipline of a Norbert or a Bernard; but rigor in an abbot who knows not how to rouse religious enthusiasm is resented as tyranny. Among the wild monks of St. Gildas the life of Abélard was in constant peril. From their obtuse and ignorant minds his wonderful gifts and acquirements commanded no awe; they were utterly ignorant of his learned language; they hated his strictness and even his piety. Violence threatened him without the walls, treachery within. They tried to poison him; they even drugged the cup of the Holy

Abélard at
St. Gildas in
Brittany.
A.D. 1125-6.

¹ "Sæpe autem, Deus scit, in tantam lapsus sum desperationem, ut Christianorum finibus excessis, ad gentes transire disponerem, atque ibi quietè sub quacunque *tributi pactione* inter inimicos Christi Christianè vivere." Does not the *tribute* point to some Mohammedan country? Had Abélard heard of the learning of the Arabs? — Hist. Calamit.

Eucharist. A monk who had tasted food intended for him died in agony. The Abbot extorted oaths of obedience, he excommunicated, he tried to the utmost the authority of his office. He was obliged at length to take refuge in a cell remote from the monastery with a very few of the better monks ; there he was watched by robbers hired to kill him.

The deserted Paraclete in the mean time had been reoccupied by far different guests. Heloisa had lived in blameless dignity as the prioress of Argenteuil. The rapacious monks of St. Denys, to whom Argenteuil belonged, expelled the nuns and resumed the property of the convent. The Paraclete, abandoned by Abélard's scholars, and falling into decay, offered to Heloisa an honorable retreat with her sisters : she took possession of the vacant cells. A correspondence began with the abbot of St. Gildas. Abélard's history of his calamities, that most naked and unscrupulous autobiography, reawakened the soft but melancholy reminiscences of the abbess of the Paraclete. Those famous letters were written, in which Heloisa dwells with such touching and passionate truth on her yet unextinguished affection. Age, sorrow, his great calamity, his persecutions, his exclusive intellectual studies, perhaps some real religious remorse, have frozen the springs of Abélard's love, if his passion may be dignified with that holy name. In him all is cold, selfish, almost coarse ; in Heloisa the tenderness of the woman is chastened by the piety of the saint : much is still warm, almost passionate, but with a deep sadness in which womanly, amorous regret is strangely mingled with the strongest language of religion.

The monastery of St. Gildas seemed at length to

have been reduced to order ; but when peace surrounded Abélard, Abélard could not be at peace. He is again before the world, again in the world ; again committed, and now in fatal strife with his great and unforgiving adversary. His writings had now obtained popularity, as wide spread, and perilous, as his lectures and his disputations. Abélard, it might seem, in desperation provoked the contest with that adversary in his stronghold. He challenged Bernard before kings and prelates whom Bernard ruled with irresistible sway ; he entered the lists against authority where authority was supreme — in a great Council. At issue with the deep devotional spirit of the age, he chose his time when all minds were excited by the most solemn action of devotion — the Crusade : he appealed to reason when reason was least likely to be heard.

A Council had been summoned at Sens for a religious ceremony which more than all others June 2, 1140. roused the passions of local and national devotion — the translation of the body of the patron saint. The king, Louis VII., the Counts of Nevers and Champagne, a train of nobles, and all the prelates of the realm were to be present. Before this audience Abélard dared his adversary to make good his charges of heresy, by which it was notorious that Bernard and his monks had branded his writings. Bernard St. Bernard. himself must deliver his opinion of Abélard's writings in his own words : he is a witness as well to their extensive dissemination as to their character in the estimation of the clergy and of the monks. " These books of Abélard are flying abroad all over the world ; they no longer shun the light ; they find their way into castles and cities ; they pass from land to land, from one

people to another. A new gospel is promulgated, a new faith is preached. Disputations are held on virtue and vice not according to Christian morality; on the Sacraments of the Church not according to the rule of faith; on the mystery of the Trinity not with simplicity and soberness. This huge Goliath, with his armor-bearer Arnold of Brescia, defies the armies of the Lord to battle!"¹ Yet so great was the estimation of Abélard's powers that Bernard at first shrunk from the contest. "How should an unpractised stripling like himself, unversed in logic, meet the giant who was practised in every kind of debate?" He consented at length to appear, not as the accuser, only as a witness against Abélard. But already he had endeavored to influence the court; he had written to the bishops of France about to assemble at Sens rebuking their remissness, by which this wood of heresies, this harvest of errors, had been allowed to grow up around the spouse of Christ. The words of Abélard cannot be cited to show his estimation of Bernard. Outwardly he had even shown respect to Bernard. On a visit of friendly courtesy to the neighboring abbess of the Paraclete a slight variation in the service had offended Bernard's rigid sense of ecclesiastical unity. Abélard, with temper but with firmness, defended the change.² But

¹ Epist. ad Innocent. Papam.

² The question was the clause in the Lord's Prayer, "our daily bread," or "our bread day by day." This letter commences in a tone almost of deference; but Abélard soon resumes his language of superiority. What he says on the greater degree of authority to be ascribed to St. Matthew's Gospel over that of St. Luke is totally at variance with the notion of plenary inspiration. He asserts from Augustine, Gregory the Great, and even Gregory VII., that usage must give way to reason; and retorts very curiously on the innovations introduced by Bernard himself into the ordinary services.

the quiet and bitter irony of his disciple, who described the contest, may be accepted as an unquestionable testimony to his way of speaking in his esoteric circle and among his intimate pupils, of the even now almost canonized saint. "Already has winged fame dispersed the odor of thy sanctity throughout the world, vaunted thy merits, declaimed on thy miracles. We boasted of the felicity of our present age, glorified by the light of so brilliant a star; we thought that the world, doomed to perdition, continued to subsist only through your merits; we knew that on your will depended the mercy of heaven, the temperature of the air, the fertility of the earth, the blessing of its fruits. . . . Thou hadst lived so long, thou hadst given life to the Church through so many holy institutions, that the very devils were thought to roar at thy behest; and we, in our littleness, boasted of our blessedness under a patron of such power." Bernard and his admirers might well hate the man whose scholars were thus taught to despise that popular superstition which beheld miracles in all his works.

With these antagonistic feelings, and this disparaging estimate each of the other, met the two great champions. In Bernard the Past and the Present concentrated all their powers and influences, the whole strength of the sacerdotal, ceremonial, inflexibly dogmatic, imaginative religion of centuries — the profound and submissive faith, the monastic austerity, the cowering superstition; he was the spiritual dictator of the age, above kings, prelates, even above the Pope, he was the model of holiness, the worker of perpetual wonders. Abélard cannot be accepted as a prophetic

¹ Berengarii Epist., in Abélard Oper., p. 303.

type of the Future. Free inquiry could only emancipate itself at a much later period by allying itself with a strong counter-religious passion ; it must oppose the strength of individual Christianity to the despotism of ecclesiastical religion. Abélard's religion (it were most unjust to question his religion) was but a colder form of the dominant faith ; he was a monk, though against his own temperament and tone of feeling. But Abélard was pure intellect, utterly unimaginative, logical to the most naked precision, analytical to the minutest subtilty ; even his devotion had no warmth ; he ruled the mind, but touched no heart. At best therefore he was the wonder, Bernard the object of admiration, reverence, love, almost of adoration.

The second day of the Council (the first had been devoted to the solemn translation of the relics) was appointed for this grand theological tournament. Not only the king, the nobles, the prelates of France, but all Christendom watched in anxious solicitude the issue of the conflict. Yet even before a tribunal so favorable, so preoccupied by his own burning words, Bernard was awed into calmness and moderation. He demanded only that the most obnoxious passages should be read from Abélard's works. It was to his amazement, no less than that of the whole council, when Abélard, instead of putting forth his whole strength in a reply, answered only, "I appeal to Rome," and left the hall of Council. It is said, to explain this unexpected abandonment of the field by the bold challenger, that he was in danger of his life. At Sens, as before at Soissons, the populace were so exasperated at the daring heretic, who was reported to have impeached the doctrine of the Trinity, that they were ready to

rise against him.¹ Bernard himself would hardly have interfered to save him from that summary refutation;² and Abélard, in the confidence of his own power and fame as a disputant, might perhaps expect Bernard to decline his challenge. He may have almost forgotten the fatal issue of the Council of Soissons; at a distance, in his retreat in Brittany, such a tribunal might appear less awful than when he saw it in undisguised and unappeased hostility before him. The Council may have been disappointed at this sudden close of the spectacle which they were assembled to behold; but they were relieved from the necessity of judging between the conflicting parties. Bernard, in the heat and pride of his triumph, after having in vain, and with taunts, provoked his mute adversary, proceeded now in no measured language to pursue his victory. The martial and unlearned prelates vainly hoped that as they had lost the excitement of the fray, they might escape the trouble and fatigue of this profound theological investigation. But the inflexible Bernard would as little spare them as he would his adversary. The faithful disciple of Abélard describes with some touches of satire, but with reality which reads like truth, the close of this memorable day. The discomfited Abélard had withdrawn; his books were now produced, a person commanded to read aloud all the objectionable parts at full length in all their logical aridity. The bishops, as evening drew on, grew weary, and relieved their fatigue with wine. The wine and the weariness brought

¹ "Dum de sua fide discuteretur, seditionem populi timens, apostolicæ sedis præsentiam appellavit." — Otho Freisingen, i. 46.

² "An non justius os loquens talia fustibus conderetur, quam rationibus repelleretur." — So writes Bernard, *Epist.* p. 1554

on sleep: the drowsy assembly sat, some leaning on their elbows, some with cushions under their heads, some with their heads dropping on their knees. At each pause they murmured sleepily "damnamus," we condemn, till at length some cut short the word and faintly breathed "ramus."¹

Abélard had appealed to Rome; at Rome his adversaries had prepared for his reception.

The report of the Council to Rome is in such terms as these: "Peter Abélard makes void the whole Christian faith by attempting to comprehend the nature of God through human reason. He ascends up into heaven, he goes down into hell. Nothing can elude him either in the height above or in the nethermost depths. A man great in his own eyes, disputing about faith against the faith, walking among the great and wonderful things which are above him, the searcher of the Divine Majesty, the fabricator of heresy. Already has his book on the Trinity been burned by order of one Council; it has now risen from the dead. Accursed is he that builds again the walls of Jericho. His branches spread over the whole earth; he boasts that he has disciples in Rome itself, even in the College of Cardinals; he draws the whole world after him; it is time therefore to silence him by apostolic authority."

An appeal from Bernard to Rome was an appeal from Bernard to himself. Pope Innocent II. was too completely under his influence, too deeply indebted to him, not to confirm at once his sentence. Bernard had already filled the ears of the Pope with the heresies of Abélard. He urged, he almost commanded, the Pope to proceed to instant judgment. "Shall he venture to

¹ Epist. Berengar. apud Abélard Oper.

appeal to the throne of Peter who denies the faith of Peter? For what has God raised thee up, lowly as thou wert in thine own eyes, and placed thee above kings and nations? Not that thou shouldest destroy but that thou shouldest build up the faith. God ^{Bernard's triumph.} has stirred up the fury of the schismatics that thou mightest have the glory of crushing it. This only was wanting to make thee equal to the most famous of thy predecessors, the condemnation of a heresy."¹ Bernard addressed another long controversial epistle to Innocent, and through him to all Christendom; it was the full view of Abélard's theology as it appeared to most of his own generation. He inveighs against Abélard's dialectic theory of the Trinity, his definition of faith as opinion; his wrath is kindled to its most fiery language by the tenet which he ascribes to Abélard, that the Son of God had not delivered man by his death from the yoke of the devil; that Satan had only the permitted and temporary power of a jailer, not full sovereignty over mankind: in other words, that man had still free-will; that Christ was incarnate rather to enlighten mankind by his wisdom and example, and died not so much to redeem them from slavery to the devil, as to show his own boundless love.² "Which is most intolerable, the blasphemy or the arrogance of his language? Which is most damnable, the temerity or the impiety? Would it not be more just to stop his mouth with blows than confute him by argument? Does not he whose hand is against

¹ Apud Labbe, et Mansi, et in Oper. S. Bernardi.

² "Ut dicat totum esse quod Deus in carne apparuit, nostram de vitâ et exemplo ipsius institutionem, sive ut postmodum dixit, instructionem: totum quod passus et mortuus est suæ erga nos charitatis ostensionem vel commendationem." — Epist. xcii. 1539.

every one, provoke the hand of every one against himself? All, he says, think thus, but I think otherwise! Who, then, art thou? What canst thou advance which is wiser, what hast thou discovered which is more subtile? What secret revelation canst thou boast which has escaped the saints and eluded the angels? Tell us what is this that thou alone canst see, that no one before thee hath seen? That the Son of God put on manhood for some purpose besides the deliverance of man from bondage. Assuredly this has been discovered by no one but by thee, and where hast thou discovered it? Thou hast received it neither from sage, nor prophet, nor apostle, nor from God himself. The apostle of the Gentiles received from God himself what he delivered to us. The apostle of the Gentiles declares that his doctrine comes from on high—‘I speak not of myself.’ But thou deliverest what is thine own, what thou hast not received. He who speaks of himself is a liar. Keep to thyself what comes from thyself. For me, I follow the prophets and the apostles. I obey the Gospel, but not the Gospel according to *Peter*. Thou makest thyself a fifth evangelist. What says the law, what say the prophets, what say the apostles, what say their successors, that which thou alone deniest, that God was made man to deliver man from bondage? What, then, if an angel should come from heaven to teach us the contrary, accursed be the error of that angel!”

Absent, unheard, unconvicted, Abélard was condemned by the Supreme Pontiff. The condemnation was uttered almost before the charge could be fully known. The decree of Innocent reprov'd all public disputations on the myste-

Condemna-
tion of
Abélard at
Rome.

ries of religion. Abélard was condemned to silence; his disciples to excommunication.¹

Abélard had set out on his journey to Rome; he was stopped by severe illness, and found hospitable reception in the Abbey of Clugny. Abélard at Clugny.

Peter the Venerable, the Abbot of that famous monastery, did more than protect the outcast to the close of his life. He had himself gone through the ordeal of a controversy with the fervent Bernard, though their controversy had been conducted in a milder and more Christian spirit. Yet the Abbot of the more luxurious or more polished Clugny might not be sorry to show a gentleness and compassion uncongenial to the more austere Clairvaux. He even wrought an outward reconciliation between the persecuted Abélard and the victorious Bernard. It was but an outward, a hollow reconciliation. Abélard published an apology, if apology it might be called, which accused his adversary of ignorance or of malice. The apology not merely repelled the charge of Arianism, Nestorianism, but even the slightest suspicion of such doctrines; and to allay the tender anxiety of Heloisa, who still took a deep interest in his fame and happiness, he sent her his creed, which might have satisfied the most austere orthodoxy. Even in the highest quarters, among the most distinguished prelates, there was at least strong compassion for Abélard, admiration for his abilities, perhaps secret indignation at the hard usage he had endured. Bernard knew that no less a person than Guido di Castello, afterwards Pope Celestine II., a disciple of Abélard, spoke of him at least with affection. To him Bernard writes, "He would not suppose that

¹ Apud Bernard, Epist. cxciv

though Guido loved the man he could love his errors.”¹ He suggests the peril of the contagion of such doctrines, and skilfully associates the name of Abélard with the most odious heresies. When he writes of the Trinity he has a savor of Arius; when of grace, of Pelagius; when of the person of Christ, of Nestorius. To the Cardinal Ivo he uses still stronger words — “Though a Baptist without in his austerities, he is a Herod within.” Still for the last two years of his life Abélard found peace, honor, seclusion, in the Abbey April 21, 1142. of Clugny. He died at the age of sixty-
Death of
Abélard. three:² Peter the Venerable communicated the tidings of his death to the still faithful Heloisa. His language may be contrasted with that of St. Bernard. “I never saw his equal for humility of manners and habits. St. Germanus was not more modest; nor St. Martin more poor. He allowed no moment to escape unoccupied by prayer, reading, writing, or dictation. The heavenly visitor surprised him in the midst of these holy works.”³ The remains of Abélard were transported to the Paraclete; an absolution obtained by Peter was deposited in his tomb; for twenty-one years the Abbess of the Paraclete mourned over her teacher, her lover, her husband; and then reposed by his side.

The intellectual movement of Abélard, as far as any acknowledged and hereditary school, died with Abélard. Even his great principle, that which he asserted rather

¹ Epist. cxii.

² Peter writes to Pope Innocent in the name of Abélard: “Ut reliquos dies vitæ et senectutis suæ, qui fortasse non multi sunt, in Cluniacâ vestrâ eum consummare jubeatis, et ne a domo quam velut passer, ne a nido quem velut turtur se invenisse gaudet, aliquorum instantiâ aut expelli aut commoveri valeat.” — Petri Venerab. Epist. ad Innocent.

³ Petri Vener. Epist. ad Heloisam.

than consistently maintained — the supremacy of reason — that principle which Bernard and the high devotional Churchmen looked on with vague but natural apprehension as eventually fatal to authority, fell into abeyance. The schoolmen connected together, as it were, reason and authority. The influence remained, but neutralized. The Book of Sentences of Peter Lombard is but the “*Sic et Non*” of Abélard in a more cautious and reverential form. John of Salisbury, in his *Polycraticus*, is a manifest, if not avowed Conceptualist. The sagacious and prophetic jealousy of his adversaries seems to have had a more clear though instinctive perception of the remoter consequences of his doctrines than Abélard himself. Abélard the philosopher seems, notwithstanding his arrogance, to be perpetually sharing these apprehensions. He is at once the boldest and most timid of men ; always striking out into the path of free inquiry, but never following it onward ; he plunges back, as if afraid of himself, into blind and submissive orthodoxy. The remorse for his moral aberrations, shame and fear of the world, seem weighing upon his mind, and repressing its free energy. He is no longer the arrogant, overbearing despot of the school ; church authority is compelling him to ungracious submission. In his Lectures, even in his later days, it is probable that he was bolder and less inconsequent ; many of the sayings on which the heaviest charges of his adversaries rested, whether withdrawn or never there, are not to be found in his works : he disclaims altogether the Book of Sentences, which may have been the note-book of his opinions by some of his scholars. He limits the notion of inspiration to a kind of moral or religious influence ; it belongs to those who

are possessed with faith, hope, and charity. He is still more restrictive on the authority of the Fathers, and openly asserts their contradictions and errors. In his idolatry of the ancient philosophers, he compares their lives with those of the clergy of his day, to the disadvantage of the latter; places them far above the Jews, and those who lived under the Jewish dispensation; and gives them a dim, indeed, yet influential and saving knowledge of the Redeemer. When Bernard, therefore, confined himself to general charges, he might stand on strong ground; when he denounced the theology of Abélard as respecting no mystery, as rashly tearing away rather than gently lifting the veil from the holiest things, of rushing into the sanctuary, and openly disdaining to believe what it could not make perview to the understanding.¹ But when he began to define his charges, he was betrayed into exaggeration and injustice. No two great minds were probably less capable of comprehending each other. Some of the gravest charges rest on works which Abélard never wrote, some on obvious misconceptions, some on illustrations assumed to be positions; all perverted into close assimilation or identification with the condemned and hated ancient heresies.

The mature and peculiar philosophy of Abélard, but for its love for barren logical forms, and this dreaded worship of reason, his Conceptualism, might in itself not merely have been reconciled with the severest orthodoxy, but might have opened a safe intermediate ground between the Nominalism of Roscelin and the Realism of Anselm and William of Champeaux. As the former tended to a sensuous rationalism, so the lat-

¹ Epist. ad Episcop. 137, 138.

ter to a mystic pantheism. If everything but the individual was a mere name, then knowledge shrunk into that which was furnished by the senses alone. When Nominalism became Theology, the three persons of the Trinity (this was the perpetual touchstone of all systems), if they were more than words, were individuals, and Tritheism inevitable. On the other hand, God, the great Reality, absorbed into himself all other Realities; they became part of God; they became God. This was the more immediate danger; the deepest devotion became Mysticism, and resolved everything into God. Mysticism in Europe, as in India, melted into Pantheism. The Conceptualism of Abélard, allowing real existence to universals, but making those universals only cognizable as mental conceptions to the individual, might be in danger of falling into Sabellianism. The three persons would be but three manifestations of the Deity; a distinction only perceptible to the mind might seem to be made to the mind alone. Yet, on the other hand, as the perception of a spiritual Deity can only be through the mind or the spirit, the mystery might seem more profound according to this view, which, while it repudiated the materializing tendencies of the former system, by its more clear and logical Idealism kept up the strong distinction between God and created things, between the human and divine mind, the all-pervading soul — and the soul of man.¹

¹ The real place which Abélard's Conceptualism (if, as I think, it has its place) holds between the crude Nominalism of Roscelin, and the mysticism, if not mystic Realism, of William of Champeaux, belongs to the history of philosophy rather than of Christianity. M. Cousin denies to Abélard any intermediate ground. On the other hand, a writer, who in my judgment sometimes writes rather loosely, at others with much sagacity, M. Xavier Rousselot, finds a separate and independent position in philosophy and in

There is one treatise, indeed, the famous "*Sic et Non*," which has been recovered in the present day, and if of itself taken as the exposition of Abélard's philosophical theology, might, though written under the semblance of profound reverence for antiquity, even from its form and title, have startled an age less devotional, less under the bondage of authority. In this treatise Abélard propounds all the great problems of religion, with the opinions, the conflicting opinions, of the Fathers; at times he may seem disposed to establish a friendly harmony, at others they are committed in irreconcilable strife. It is a history of the antagonism and inward discord, of the disunity of the Church. Descartes himself did not establish the principle of doubt as the only source of true knowledge more coldly and nakedly, or more offensively to his own age from its cautious justification in the words of him who is all truth.¹ If Bernard knew this treatise, it explains at once all Bernard's implacable hostility; to himself, no doubt, the suppression of such principles would justify any means of coercion, almost any departure from ordinary rules of fairness and justice. It is nothing that to the calmer judgment the

theology for the system of Abélard. Abélard certainly must have deceived himself if he was no more than a concealed Nominalist. See the summary of Abélard's opinions in Haureau, *de la Philosophie Scolastique*. M. Haureau defines Abélard's Conceptualism as a "*Nominalisme raisonnable*. La philosophie d'Abélard est la philosophie de la prudence, la philosophie du sens commun." If I may presume to say so, Abélard was less led to this intermediate position by his own prudence, than by his keen sagacity in tracing the consequences of Nominalism and extreme Realism. See also C. de Rémusat, Abélard.

¹ "*Dubitare enim de singulis non erit inutile. Dubitando enim ad inquisitionem venimus; inquirendo veritatem percipimus, juxta quos et Veritas ipsa 'quærite et invenietis, pulsate et aperiatur vobis.'*" — Prolog. ad *Sic et Non*.

"Sic et Non" by no means fulfils its own promise, that it is far more harmless to the devout than it threatens to be; far less satisfactory to the curious and speculative: it must be taken in its spirit, to estimate the rude shock which it must have given to the yet unawakened, or but half-awakened mind of Christendom: so only can a judgment be formed on the real controversy between the Founder of the Paraclete and the Abbot of Clairvaux.¹

¹ M. Cousin has only printed parts of the Sic et Non. But he has given the heads of the chapters omitted, many of which more provoke the curiosity than those which he has chosen. The whole Sic et Non has now been printed at Marburg from another manuscript (at Munich), by Henke and Lindenkohl, Marburg, 1851. Father Tosti, a monk of Monte Casino, author of a life or apology for Boniface VIII. (hereafter to be quoted), has published a life of Abelard, written with more candor than might be expected from such a quarter. He was urged to this work by finding in the archives of Monte Casino MSS. containing unpublished fragments of Abelard's *Theologia Christiana*, and of the Sic et Non, of which he had only seen concise extracts.

In fact, the Sic et Non is nothing but a sort of manual for scholastic disputation, of which it was the rule that each combatant must fight, right or wrong. It was an armory from which disputants would find weapons to their hands on any disputable point; and all points of the rule of this warfare were disputable.

CHAPTER VI.

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

BERNARD had triumphed over the intellectual insurrection against the authority of the Church ; but there was a rebellion infinitely more dangerous, at least in its immediate consequences, brooding in the minds of men : the more formidable because more popular, the more imminent because it appealed at once to the passions and the plain vulgar sense of man. To judge from the number of his disciples, Abélard's was a popular movement ; that of Arnold was absolutely, avowedly democratic ; it raised a new class of men, and to them transferred at once power, authority, wealth. There was an ostensible connection between these two outbursts of freedom, which at first sight might appear independent of, almost incongruous with, each other, except in their common hostility to the hierarchical system. Arnold of Brescia was a hearer of Abélard, a pupil in his revolutionary theology or revolutionary philosophy, and aspired himself to a complete revolution in civil affairs : he was called, as has been seen, the armor-bearer of the giant Abélard. The two were even more nearly allied in their kindred origin. Monasticism was the common parent of both. The theory of monasticism, which was acknowledged even by most of the clergy themselves to be the absolute perfection of Chris-

tianity, its true philosophy, was in perpetual and glaring contradiction with the actual visible state of the clergy and of the older and wealthier monasteries. This theory was the total renunciation of the world, of property, even of volition; it was the extreme of indigence, the scantiest fare, the coarsest dress, the lowliest demeanor, the hardest toil, both in the pursuits of industry and in the offices of religion; the short and interrupted sleep, the incessant devotional exercise, usually the most severe self-inflicted pain. The poorer, the more mortified, the more secluded, the more absolutely cut off from all indulgence, the nearer to sanctity. Nor was this a remote, obsolete, traditionary theory. Every new aspirant after monastic perfection, every founder of an order, and of every recent monastery, exemplified, or he would never have founded an order or built a monastery, this poor, self-abasing, self-exercuating holiness. Stephen Harding, Bernard and his followers, and all who lived up to their principles in their own persons, to those around them and by their wide-spread fame, stood before the world not merely as beacon-lights of true Christianity, but as uttering a perpetual protest, a rebuke against the lordly, rich, and luxurious prelates and abbots. Their vital principles, their principles of action, were condemnatory of ecclesiastical riches. "It is just," writes St. Bernard, "that he who serves the altar should live of the altar; but it is not to live of the altar to indulge luxury and pride at the expense of the altar: this is robbery, this is sacrilege."¹

¹ "Concedatur ergo tibi ut si bene deservis de altario vivas, non autem ut de altario luxurieris, ut de altario superbias, ut inde compares tibi frena aurea, sellas depictas, calcearia deargentata, varia grisiaque pellicia a collo

The subtle, by no means obvious, distinction, that the wealth of the Church was the wealth of God;¹ that the patrimony of the Papacy was not in the Pope, but in St. Peter, and of every other church in its patron saint; that not merely the churches, but the conventual edifices, with all their offices, stables, granaries, and gardens (wanting, perhaps, to the noblest castle), were solely for the glory of God, not for the use and pride of man; that the clergy on their palfreys with golden bits, and embroidered housings, and silver spurs, and furred mantles of scarlet or purple, were not men, but ministers of God; this convenient merging of the individual in the official character, while the individual enjoyed personally all the admiration, envy, respect, comfort, luxury, influence of his station, might satisfy the conscience of those whose conscience desired to be satisfied, but was altogether unintelligible to the common sense of mankind. The more devout abbots and prelates, some doubtless of the Popes, might wear the haircloth under the robe of purple and of fur; they might sit at the gorgeous banquet tasting only the dry bread or simple vegetable; after the pomp and ceremony of some great day of temporal or ecclesiastical business, might pass the night on the rough board or the cold stone, or on their knees in the silent church, unobserved by men: the outward show of pride or luxury might be secretly repressed or chastened by the most austere fast, by the bloody penitential scourge. But mankind judges, if unjustly towards individuals, justly

et manibus ornatu purpureo diversifac̃ta. Denique quicquid præter necessarium victum ac simplicem vestitum de altario retineas tuum non est, impium est, sacrilegum est." — Bernard, Epist. ad Fulcon.

¹ "Saltem quæ Dei sunt *ipsius* violenter auferre nolite." — Epist. Nicol. 1. ad Aquitan. apud Bouquet, p. 416.

perhaps of systems and institutions, from the outward and manifest effects. A clergy with an ostentatious display of luxury and wealth was to them a wealthy and luxurious clergy — a clergy which was always grasping after power, an ambitious clergy. Who could question, who refuse to see the broad irresistible fact of this discrepancy between the monastic theory, constantly preached and lauded in their ears, to which they were to pay, to which they were not disinclined to pay, respect bordering on adoration, and the ordinary actual Christianity of the great ecclesiastical body? If poverty was apostolic, if poverty was of Christ himself, if the only real living likenesses of the Apostles and of Christ were the fasting, toiling, barely-clad, self-scourging monks, with their cheeks sunk by famine, their eyes on the ground, how far from the Apostles, how far from Christ, were those princely bishops, those abbots, holding their courts like sovereigns! The cowering awe of the clergy, the influence of the envied wealth and state itself, might repress, but it would not subdue, if once awakened, the sense of this discrepancy. But once boldly stirred by a popular teacher, by a man of vehement eloquence, unsuspected sincerity, restless activity, unimpeachable religious orthodoxy, how fearful to the hierarchy, to the whole sacerdotal system! — and such a man was Arnold of Brescia.¹

Arnold was a native of the Lombard city of Brescia. Of his youth and education nothing is known. His adolescence ripened amid the Arnold a disciple of Abelard. advancing political republicanism of the Lombard cities.

¹ The birth of Arnold is vaguely assigned to the beginning of the twelfth century. Guadagnani conjectures with some probability that he was born about 1105. There is a life of Arnold by H. Francke, "Arnold von Brescia," Zurich, 1825.

With the inquisitive and aspiring youth from all parts of Europe, he travelled to France, to attend the great instructor of the times, Peter Abélard, probably at that period when Abélard was first settled in the wilderness of the Paraclete, and when his high-born and wealthy scholars submitted to such severe privations in pursuit of knowledge, and became monks in all but religious submissiveness. Arnold throughout his life passed as a disciple, as a faithful follower of Abélard. But while others wrought out the daring speculative views of Abélard, delighted in his logical subtilties, and with him endeavored to tear away the veil which hung over the sacred mysteries of the faith, Arnold seized on the practical, the political, the social consequences. On all the high mysterious doctrines of the Church, the orthodoxy of Arnold was unimpeachable ; his personal life was that of the sternest monk ; he had the most earnest sympathy with the popular religion. On the Sacraments alone his opinions were questioned ; and as to them, rather on account of their connection with the great object of his hostility, the sacerdotal power. The old edifice of the hierarchy, which had been rising for centuries till it governed the world, possessed in all the kingdoms a very large proportion of the land ; had assumed the judicial, in some cases the military functions of the state ; had raised the Pope to a sovereign prince, who, besides his own dominions, held foreign kingdoms in feudal subordination to himself : all this Arnold aspired to sweep away from the face of the earth. He would reduce the clergy to their primitive and apostolic poverty ;¹ confiscate all their

¹ "Primitias et quæ devotio plebis
Offerat, et decimas castos in corporis usus,

wealth, escheat all their temporal power. Their estates he secularized at once; he would make them ministers of religion and no more, modestly maintained by the first fruits and tithes of the people. And that only as a holy clergy, on a voluntary system, but in every respect subject to the supreme civil power. On that power, too, Arnold would boldly lay his reforming hand. His Utopia was a great Christian republic, exactly the reverse of that of Gregory VII. As religious and as ambitious as Hildebrand, Arnold employed the terrors of the other world, with as little scruple to depose, as the pontiff to exalt the authority of the clergy. Salvation was impossible to a priest holding property, a bishop exercising temporal power, a monk retaining any possession whatever. This he grounded not on the questionable authority of the Church, but on the plain Gospel of Christ: to that Gospel he appealed with intrepid confidence. It was the whole feudal system, imperial as well as pontifical, which was to vanish away: the temporal sovereign was to be the fountain of honor, of wealth, of power. To the sovereign were to revert all the possessions of the Church, the estates of the monasteries, the royalties of the Pope and the bishops.¹ But that sovereign was a popular assembly. Like other fond republicans, Arnold hoped to find in a

Non ad luxuriam, neve oblectamina carnis
Concedens, mollesque cibos, cultusque nitorem,
Illicitosque jocos, lascivaque gaudia cleri,
Pontificum fastus, abbatum denique laxos
Damnabat penitus mores, monachosque superbos."

Gunther, iii. 273, &c.

¹ "Dicebat nec clericos proprietatem, nec episcopi os regalia, nec monachos possessiones habentes aliquâ ratione salvâri posse. Cuncta hæc principis esse, ab ejusque beneficiâ in usum tantum laicorum cedere oportere." — *Otho Freisingen.*

democratic senate, chosen out of, and chosen by, the unchristian as well as the Christian part of the community, that Christianity for which he looked in vain in the regal and pontifical autocracies, in the episcopal and feudal oligarchies of the time.¹ This, which the most sanguine in the nineteenth century look upon as visionary, or, after a long discipline of religious and social education, but remotely possible, Arnold hoped to raise as if by enchantment, among the rude, ignorant, oppressed lower classes of the twelfth. So the alliance of the imperial and pontifical power, which in the end was so fatal to Arnold, was grounded on no idle fear or wanton tyranny, it was an alliance to crush a common enemy.

The Church of Rome has indeed boasted her natural sympathy and willing league with freedom. Her confederacy with the young republics of Lombardy is considered the undeniable manifestation of this spirit. But there at least her love of freedom was rather hatred of the imperial power; it was a struggle at their cost for her own aggrandizement. In Brescia, as in many other cities in the north of Italy, the Bishop Arimanno had taken the lead in shaking off all subjection to the Empire. Brescia declared herself a republic, and established a municipal government; but the bishop usurped the sovereignty wrested from the Empire. He assumed the state, the power of a feudal lord; the estates of the Church were granted as fiefs, on the condition of military service to defend his authority. Brescia complained

¹ "Omnia principiis terrenis subdita, tantum
Committenda viris popularibus atque regenda."

Gunther, iii. 277

with justice that the Church and the poor were robbed to maintain the secular pomp of the baron. The republican spirit, kindled by the bishop, would not endure his tyranny. He was worsted in a bloody and desolating war; he was banished for three years to the distance of fifty miles from the city. Arimanno, the bishop, was deposed by Pope Paschal in the Lateran Council at Rome, A.D. 1116; his coadjutor Conrad promoted to the see. Conrad sought to raise again the fallen power of the bishopric, and Conrad in his turn was dispossessed by his coadjutor Manfred. Innocent II. appeared in Brescia. There is little doubt that Conrad had embraced the faction of the Antipope ^{July 26-29,} Anacletus, Manfred therefore was confirmed ^{1132.} in the see. The new bishop attempted, in a synod at Brescia, to repress the concubinage and likewise the vices of the clergy; but in the assertion of his temporal power he was no less ambitious and overbearing than his predecessors. To execute his decree he entered into a league with the consuls of the city. But the married clergy and their adherents were too strong for the bishop and the adherents of the rigorists. The consuls and the bishop were expelled from the city. Manfred was afterwards replaced by the legate of the Pope, and now appears to have thrown himself into the party of the nobles.

It was in this state of affairs that the severe and blameless Arnold began to preach his captivating but alarming doctrines. Prelates like Manfred and his predecessors were not likely to awe those who esteemed apostolic poverty and apostolic lowliness the only true perfection of the Christian. Secular pomp and luxury were almost inseparable from secular power. The

clergy of a secular bishop would hardly be otherwise than secular. Arnold, on his return to Brescia, had received the two lower orders of the Church as a reader; he then took the religious vow and became a monk: a monk of primitive austerity.¹ He was a man of stern republican virtue, and of stern republican sentiments; his enemies do justice to his rigid and blameless character. The monk in truth and the republican had met in him, the admirer of the old Roman liberty and of the lowly religion of Christ. He was seemingly orthodox in all his higher creed, though doubts were intimated of his soundness on image-worship, on relics, on infant baptism, and the Eucharist — those strong foundations of the sacerdotal power.² From his austerity, and the silence of his adversaries as to such obnoxious opinions, it is probable that he was severe on the question of the marriage of the clergy; he appears standing alone, disconnected with that faction. His eloquence was singularly sweet, copious, and flowing, but at the same time vigorous and awakening, sharp as a sword and soft as oil.³ He called upon the people to compel the clergy, and especially the bishop, to retire altogether into their proper functions; to abandon all temporal power, all property. The populace listened to his doctrines with fanatic ardor; he preached in the

¹ "Arnoldum loquor de Brixia qui utinam tam sanæ esset doctrinæ quam districtæ est vitæ; et si vultis scire, homo est neque manducans neque bibens, solo cum diabolo esuriens et sitiens sanguinem animarum." — Bernard, Epist. 195.

² "Præter hæc de sacramento altaris et baptismo parvulorum non sanè dicitur sensisse." — Otho Freisingen. Did he attach the validity of the rite to the holiness of the priest?

³ "Lingua ejus gladius acutus — molliti sunt sermones ejus sicut oleum, et ipsa sunt jacula — allicit blandis sermonibus." — Bernard, Epist. 195; see also 196. "Pulcrum fallendi noverat artem . . . mellifluis admiscens toxica verbis." — Gunther.

pulpits and the market-places, incessantly, boldly, and fearless whom he might assail, the Pope himself, or the lowliest priest, in the deep inward conviction of the truth of his own doctrines. He unfolded the dark pages of ecclesiastical history to a willing auditory.¹ The whole city was in the highest state of excitement; and not Brescia alone, the doctrines spread like wildfire through Lombardy; many other cities were moved if not to tumult, to wild expectation.² Some of the nobles as laymen had been attracted by the doctrines of Arnold; but most of them made common cause with the bishop, who was already of their faction. The bishopric was a great benefice, which each might hope to fill with some one of his own family. The bishop therefore, the whole clergy, the wealthier monasteries, the higher nobles, were bound together by their common fears, by their common danger. Yet even then a popular revolution was averted only by an appeal to Rome—to Rome where Innocent, his rival overthrown, was presiding in the great Council of the Lateran; Innocent replaced on his throne by all the great monarchs of Christendom, and environed by a greater number of prelates than had ever assembled in any Council.

Before that supreme tribunal Arnold was accused,

¹ Even Gunther is betrayed into some praise.

“Veraque multa quidem nisi tempora nostra fideles
Respuerant monitus, falsis admixta monebat.”

“Dum Brixiensem ecclesiam perturbaret, laicisque terræ illius, prurientes
erga clerum aures habentibus, ecclesiasticas malitiose exponeret paginas.”

—Otho Freisingen, ii. 20.

² “Ille suum vecors in clerum pontificemque,
... atque alias plures commoverat urbes.”

Gunther.

not it should seem of heresy, but of the worst kind of schism ;¹ his accusers were the bishop and all the higher clergy of Brescia. Rome, it is said, shuddered, as she might with prophetic dread, at the doctrine and its author ; yet the Council was content with imposing silence on Arnold, and banishment from Italy. With this decree the bishops and the clergy returned to Brescia ; the fickle people were too much under the terror of their religion to defend their teacher.² The nobles seized the opportunity of expelling the two popular consuls, who were branded as hypocrites and heretics. Arnold fled beyond the Alps, and took refuge in Zurich. It is singular to observe this more than Protestant, sowing as it were the seeds of that total abrogation of the whole hierarchical system, completed in Zurich by Zuingle, the most extreme of the reformers in the age of Luther.

Arnold condemned by the Council of Lateran. April, 1139.

Arnold in Zurich.

Beyond the Alps Arnold is again the scholar, the faithful and devoted scholar of Abélard. Neither their admirers nor their enemies seem to discern the vital difference between the two ; they are identified by their common hostility to the authority of the Church. Abélard addressed the abstract reason, Arnold the popular passions ; Abélard undermined the great dogmatic system, Arnold boldly assailed the vast temporal power of the Church ; Abélard treated the hierarchy with respect, but brought into question the doctrines of the Church ; Arnold, with deep reverence for the doctrines,

¹ "Accusatus est apud dominum Papam *schismate pessime*." — St. Bernard. There is no evidence that he was involved in the condemnation of Peter of Brueys and the Cathari in the 23d canon.

² Malvezzi apud Muratori, vol. xiv.

shook sacerdotal Christianity to its base ; Abélard was a philosopher, Arnold a demagogue. Bernard was watching both with the persevering sagacity of jealousy, and of fear for his own imperilled faith, his imperilled Church. His fiery zeal was not content with the condemnation of Abélard by the Council of Sens,¹ and the Pope's rescript condemnatory of Arnold in the Lateran Council. He urged the Pope to take further measures for their condemnation, for the burning of their books, and secure custody of their persons. The obsequious Pope, in a brief but violent letter addressed to the Archbishops of Reims and Sens and to the Abbot of Clairvaux, commanded that the books containing such damnable doctrines should be publicly cast into the fire, the two heresiarchs separately imprisoned in some religious house. The papal letter was disseminated throughout France by the restless activity of Bernard,² but men were weary or ashamed of the persecution ; he was heard with indifference. Abélard, as has been seen, found a retreat in the abbey of Clugny ; what was more extraordinary, Arnold found a ^{Arnold with} protector in a papal legate, in a future Pope, ^{Guido di} ^{Castello.} the Cardinal Guido di Castello. Like Arnold, Guido had been a scholar of Abélard, he had betrayed so much sympathy with his master as to receive the rebuke,

¹ It is not clear at what time or in what manner Arnold undertook the defence of Abélard's dangerous propositions. Abélard and his disciples had maintained silence before the Council of Sens ; and there Arnold was not present.

² See Nicolini's preface to his tragedy of Arnold of Brescia : — " Ut Petrum Abeilardum et Arnoldum de Brixia, perversi dogmatis fabricatores et catholicæ fidei impugnatores, in religiosis locis, ut iis melius fuerint, separatim faciant includi, et libros eorum, ubicunque reperti fuerint, igne comburi." — 1140, July 16. Mansi, xxi. St. Bernard Oper., Appendix,

above alluded to, from Bernard, softened only by the dignity of his position and character. His protection of Arnold was more open and therefore more offensive to the Abbot of Clairvaux. He wrote in a mingled tone of earnest admonition and angry expostulation. "Arnold of Brescia, whose words are as honey but whose doctrines are poison, whom Brescia cast forth, at whom Rome shuddered, whom France has banished, whom Germany will soon hold in abomination, whom Italy will not endure, is reported to be with you. Either you know not the man, or hope to convert him. May this be so ; but beware of the fatal infection of heresy ; he who consorts with the suspected becomes liable to suspicion ; he who favors one under the papal excommunication, contravenes the Pope, and even the Lord God himself."¹

The indefatigable Bernard traced the fugitive Arnold into the diocese of Constance. He wrote in the most vehement language to the bishop denouncing Arnold as the author of tumult and sedition, of insurrection against the clergy, even against bishops, of arraying the laity against the spiritual power. No terms are too harsh ; besides the maledictory language of the Psalms, "His mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, and his feet swift to shed blood," he calls him the enemy of the Cross of Christ, the fomentor of discord, the fabricator of schism. He urges the bishop to seize and imprison this wandering disturber of the peace ; such had been the Pope's command, but men had shrunk from that good deed. The Bishop of Constance was at least not active in the

¹ Bernardi Epist. The expression "quem Germania abominabitur" favors the notion that Guido was Legate in Germany. So hints Guagnani.

pursuit of Arnold. Zurich was again for some time his place of refuge, or rather the Alpine valleys, where, at least from the days of Claudius Bishop of Turin, tenets kindred to his own, and hostile, if not Zurich, to the doctrines, to some of the usages of the Church, to the power and wealth of the clergy, had lurked in the hearts of men. The Waldenses look up to Arnold as to one of the spiritual founders of their churches; and his religious and political opinions probably fostered the spirit of republican independence which throughout Switzerland and the whole Alpine district was awaiting its time.¹

For five years all traces of Arnold are lost; on a sudden he appears in Rome under the protec- Arnold in Rome. tion of the intrepid champion of the new republic which had wrested the sovereignty of the city from the Pope, and had abrogated his right to all temporal possessions. In the foundation of this republic Arnold had personally no concern, but the influence of his doctrines doubtless much. The Popes, who had beheld with satisfaction the rise of the Lombard commonwealths, or openly approved their revolt, were startled to find a republic springing up in Rome itself. Many Romans had crossed the Alps to the school of Abélard; but the practical doctrines of Abélard's scholar were more congenial to their turbulent minds than the abstract lore of the master. Innocent II.

¹ "Nobile Torregium, ductoris nomine falso
Insedit, totamque brevi sub tempore terram,
Perfidus, impuri fœdavit dogmatis aurâ.
Unde venenato dudum corrupta sapore,
Et nimium falsi doctrinæ vatis inherens,
Servat adhuc uvæ gustum gens illa paternæ."

seemed doomed to behold the whole sovereignty, feudal as well as temporal, dissolve in his hands. The wars with Naples to assert his feudal title had ended in the establishment of Roger of Sicily in the independent kingdom of Naples. The Roman passion for liberty was closely allied, as in all the Italian republics, with less generous sentiments — an implacable hatred of liberty in others. There had been a long jealousy between Tivoli and Rome. Tivoli proclaimed its independence of Rome and of the Pope. It had despised the excommunication of the Pope and inflicted a disgraceful defeat on the Romans, as yet the Pope's loyal subjects, under the Pope himself. After a war of at least a year Tivoli was reduced to capitulate; but Innocent, who perhaps might look hereafter to the strength of Tivoli as a check upon unruly Rome, refused to gratify the revenge of the Romans by dismantling and razing the city walls and dispersing the inhabitants. The Romans turned their baffled vengeance on Innocent himself. Rome assembled in the Capitol, declared itself a republic, restored the senate, proposed to elect a patrician, and either actually withdrew or threatened to withdraw all temporal allegiance from the Pope. But as yet they were but half scholars of Arnold; they only shook off the yoke of the Pope to place themselves under the yoke of the Emperor. The republicans addressed a letter to the Emperor Conrad, declaring that it was their object to restore the times of Justinian and of Constantine. The Emperor might now rule in the capital of the world, over Germany and Italy, with more full authority than any of his predecessors: all obstacles from the ecclesiastical power were removed; they concluded with five verses. Let the Emperor do

his will on all his enemies, establish his throne in Rome, and govern the world like another Justinian, and let Peter, according to the commandment of Christ, pay tribute to Cæsar.¹ But they warned him at the same time that his aid must be speedy and strong. "The Pope had made a league with the King of Sicily, whom, in return for large succors to enable him to defy the Emperor, he had invested in all the insignia of royalty. Even in Rome the Pope, the Frangipani, the Sicilians, all the nobles, even the family of Peter Leonis, except their leader Giordano, had conspired to prevent them, the Roman people, from bestowing on Conrad the imperial crown. In order that this army might reach Rome in safety, they had restored the Mil-
Death of
Innocent II.
Sept. 23.
1143.
vian bridge; but without instant haste all might be lost." In the midst of these tumults Innocent died, closing a Pontificate of fourteen years.

The successor of Innocent was Guido di Castello, the cardinal of St. Mario, the scholar of Abélard, the protector of Arnold. He was elected, from what motive or through what interest does not appear, yet by the unanimous suffrage of the cardinals and amidst the acclamations of the people.² He took the
Sept. 26.
Cœlestine II.
name of Cœlestine II. The only act of

¹ "Rex valeat, quicquid cupit, obtineat, super hostes
 Imperium teneat, Romæ sedeat, regat orbem:
 Princeps terrarum, ceu fecit Justinianus;
 Cæsaris accipiat Cæsar, quæ sunt sua Præsul,
 Ut Christus jussit, Petro solvente tributum."

Otho Freisingen, i. 28.

² The Life of Cœlestine is at issue with his own letters. The Life asserts that the people were absolutely excluded from all share in the election. Cœlestine writes: "Clero et populo acclamante, partim et expetente." — *Epist. ad Petr. Venerab.*

Cœlestine was one of gentleness and peace; he received the ambassadors of Louis VII., King of France, pronounced his benediction on the kingdom, and so repealed the Interdict with which Innocent had rewarded the faithful services of his early patron and almost humble vassal.¹ Even the turbulence of the people was overawed; they might seem to await in anxious expectation how far the protector of Arnold might favor their resumption of the Roman liberties.

These hopes were disappointed by the death of Cœlestine after a pontificate of less than six months. On the
 March 8, accession of Lucius II., a Bolognese by birth,
 1144.
 Lucius II. the republic boldly assumed the ideal form
 imagined by Arnold of Brescia. The senate and the
 March 12. people assembled in the Capitol, and elected
 a Patrician,² Giordano, the descendant of Peter Leonis. They announced to the Pope their submission to his spiritual authority, but to his spiritual authority alone. They declared that the Pope and the clergy must content themselves from that time with the tithes and oblations of the people; that all the temporalities, the

¹ The interdict related to the election to the archbishopric of Bourges. The king, according to usage, named a candidate to the chapter. The Pope commanded the obsequious chapter to elect Peter de la Chatre, nephew to the Chancellor of the Roman Church. Even Louis was provoked to wrath; he swore that Peter de la Chatre should never sit as Archbishop of Bourges. "We must teach this young man," said the haughty Pope, "not thus to meddle with the affairs of the Church." He gave the pall to the archbishop, who had fled to Rome. The interdict followed: wherever the King of France appeared, ceased all the divine offices. The interdict was raised by Cœlestine; but Peter de la Chatre was Archbishop of Bourges. — Compare Martin, *Hist. de France*, iii. 434.

² This appears from the words of Otho Freisingen: "Senatoribus, quos ante instituerant, *patricium* adjiciunt." — Otho Freisingen, vii. 31. What place did this leave for the Emperor? I conceive, therefore, that the letter to the Emperor belongs to the pontificate of Innocent, where I have placed it.

royalties, and rights of sovereignty fell to the temporal power, and that power was the Patrician.¹ They proceeded to make themselves masters of the city, attacked and levelled to the ground many of the fortress palaces of the cardinals and the nobles. The Pope, Dec. 23 after some months, wrote an urgent letter to the Emperor Conrad to claim his protection against his rebellious subjects. To the appeal of the Romans, calling him to the sovereignty, Conrad, spell-bound perhaps by the authority of Bernard, however tempting the occasion might be, paid no attention ; even if more inclined to the cause of the Pope, he had no time for interference. Pope Lucius had recourse to more immediate means of defence. He armed the pontifical party, and that party comprehended all the nobles : it had become a contest of the oligarchy and the democracy. He placed himself at their head, obtained, it should seem, some success,² but in an attempt to storm the Capitol in the front of his soldiers he was mortally Feb. 25, 1145. wounded with a stone. To have slain a Pope Death of Lucius II. afflicted the Romans with no remorse. The papal party felt no shame at the unseemly death of a Pope who had fallen in actual war for the defence of his temporal power ; republican Rome felt no compunction at the fall of her enemy. Yet the death of Lucius seems to have extinguished for a time the ambition of the cardinals. Instead of rival Popes contending for advancement, Pope and Antipope in eager haste to array themselves in the tiara, all seemed to shrink from the perilous dignity. They drew forth from the cloister of

¹ "Ad jus patricii sui repossunt." — Otho Freisingen, *loc. cit.* This was pure Arnoldism.

² "Senatum abrogare coegit." — Cardin. Arragon. in *Vita Lucii*.

the Cistercian monks the Abbot, Bernard of Pisa, a Eugenius III. devout man, but obscure and of simplicity, it was supposed, bordering on imbecility. His sole recommendation was that he was a Cistercian, a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux, of Bernard the tried foe of Abélard and of Arnold of Brescia, Bernard through whom alone they could hope for the speedy succor of the Transalpine sovereigns. "In electing you," says Bernard himself, "they made me Pope, not you."¹ The saint's letter of congratulation is in a tone of mingled superiority and deference, in which the deference is formal, the superiority manifest. To the conclave Bernard remonstrated against the cruelty, almost the impiety, of dragging a man dead to the world back into the peril and turmoil of worldly affairs. He spoke almost with contempt of the rude character of Eugenius III. "Is this a man to gird on the sword and to execute vengeance on the people, to bind their kings with chains and their nobles with links of iron?" (Such at present appeared to Bernard the office of Christ's representative on earth!) "How will a man with the innocence and simplicity of a child cope with affairs which require the strength of a giant?"² Bernard was for once mistaken in his estimate of human character. Eugenius III. belied all expectations by the unsuspected vigor of his conduct. He was compelled, indeed, at first to bow before the storm: on the third day after his election he left Rome to receive his consecration in the monastery of Farfa.

Arnold of Brescia at the head of a large force of Swiss mountaineers who had imbibed his doctrines, was

¹ "Aiunt non vos esse papam, sed me." — Epist. 237, 8.

² Epist. 236. He calls him "pannosum homuncionem."

now in Rome.¹ His eloquence brought over ^{Arnold I in} the larger part of the nobles to the popular ^{Rome.} side; even some of the clergy were infected by his doctrines. The republic, under his influence, affected to resume the constitution of elder Rome. The office of prefect was abolished, the Patrician Giordano established in full authority. They pretended to create anew patrician families, an equestrian order; the name and rights of tribunes of the people were to balance the power of the Senate; the laws of the commonwealth were reënacted.² Nor were they forgetful of more substantial provisions for their power. The Capitol was rebuilt and fortified; even the church of St. Peter was sacrilegiously turned into a castle. The Patrician took possession of the Vatican, imposed taxes, and exacted tribute by violence from the pilgrims. Rome began again to speak of her sovereignty over the world. On the expulsion of Eugenius, the indefatigable Bernard addressed a letter to the Roman people in his usual tone of haughty apology for his interference; a protest of his own insignificance while he was dictating to nations and kings. He mingles what he means for gentle persuasion with the language of awful menace. "Not only will the powers of earth, but the martyrs of heaven fight against a rebellious people." In one

¹ "Arnoldus Alpinorum turbam ad se traxit et Roman cum multitudine ~~ruit.~~" — Fasti Corbeienses. See Muller, Schweitzer's Geschichte, i. 409, 1 277. Eugen., Epist. 4.

² "Quin etiam titulos urbis renovare vetustos,
Patricios recreare viros, priscosque Quirites,
Nomine plebeio secernere nomen equestre;
Jura tribunorum, sanctum reparare senatum;
Et senio fessas, mutasque reponere leges;
Reddere primevo Capitolia prisca nitore."

Gunther.

part, he dexterously inquires how far they themselves had become richer by the plunder of the churches. It was as the religious capital of the world that Rome was great and wealthy ; they were cutting off all their real glory and riches by ceasing to be the city of St. Peter.¹ In another letter, he called on the Emperor Conrad to punish this accursed and tumultuous people.

But Eugenius owed to his own intrepid energy and conduct at least a temporary success. He launched his sentence of excommunication against the rebel Patrician : Rome was too much accustomed to such thunders to regard them. He appealed to more effective arms, the implacable hatred and jealousy of the neighboring cities. Tivoli was always ready to take arms against Rome, (Innocent II. had foreseen the danger of dismantling this check on Rome,) other cities sent their troops ; Eugenius was in person at Civita Castellana, Narni, Viterbo, where he took up his residence. The proud republic was compelled to capitulate. The Patrician abdicated his short-lived dignity ; the Prefect resumed his functions ; the Senate was permitted to exist, but shorn of its power.² A general amnesty was granted to all concerned in the late commotions. Some of the Roman nobles, the great family of the Frangipani, out of rivalry perhaps to the Peter Leonis, had remained faithful to the Pope.

Eugenius returned to Rome, and celebrated Christmas with pomp at least sufficient to give an appearance of popularity to his resumption of author-

Eugenius re-
covers Rome.

A.D. 1145-
1146.

¹ Epist. 242, 243.

² In the few fragments of the historians we trace the influence, but little of the personal history of Arnold. We know not whether he remained in Rome during the short triumph of Eugenius.

ity: he was attended by some of the nobles, and all the clergy.

But without the walls of Rome, at the head of a hostile army, the Pope was an object of awe; within the city with only his Roman partisans, he was powerless. He might compel Rome to abandon her republican constitution, he could not her hatred of Tivoli. Under this black standard rallied all her adversaries: only on the condition of his treachery to Tivoli, which had befriended him in his hour of necessity, would Rome continue to obey him. Eugenius left the city in disgust; he retired first to Viterbo, then to Sienna; eventually, after the delay of a year, beyond the Alps.¹ Arnold and Arnold's republic resumed uncontested possession of the capital of Christendom.

Eugenius
flies.
March 23,
1146.

Beyond the Alps the Cistercian Pontiff sank into the satellite of the great Cistercian ruler of Christendom. The Pope maintained the state, the authority was with St. Bernard. Three subjects, before the arrival of Eugenius in France, had occupied the indefatigable thoughts of Bernard. The two first display his all-grasping command of the mind of Christendom; but it was the last which so completely absorbed his soul, that succors to the Pope struggling against his rebellious subjects, the sovereignty of Rome, might seem beneath his regard.

In France.

The Abbot of Clairvaux was involved in a disputed election to the Archbishopric of York. The narrow corporate spirit of his order betrayed him into great and crying injustice to William, the elected prelate of that See. The rival of the English-

Bernard and
William of
York.

¹ He was at Vercelli, March 3, 1147; at Clugny, 26; at Dijon, 30.

man, another William, once a Cluniac, was a Cistercian; and Bernard scruples not to heap on one of the most pious of men accusations of ambition, of worse than ambition: to condemn him to everlasting perdition.¹ The obsequious Pope, no doubt under the same party influence, or quailing under the admonitions of Bernard, which rise into menace, issued his sentence of deposition against William. England, true to that independence which she had still asserted under her Norman sovereigns, refused obedience. King Stephen even prohibited his bishops from attending the Pope's summons to a Council at Rheims; the Archbishop of Canterbury was obliged to cross the sea clandestinely in a small boat.² William eventually triumphed over all opposition, obtained peaceable possession of the see, died in the odor of sanctity, and has his place in the sacred calendar.

Bernard had detected new heresies in the church of France. Gilbert de la Porée, the aged Bishop of Poitiers, was charged with heterodox conceptions of the divine nature.³ This controversy wearied out two Councils; bewildered by the metaphysical sub-

Gilbert de la
Porée.

¹ "Epist. 241. "Sævit frustrata ambitio: imo desperata furit. . . . Clamat contra eorum capita sanguis sanctorum de terrâ." "St. William showed no enmity, sought no revenge against his most inveterate enemies, who had prepossessed Eugenius III. against him by the blackest calumnies." — Butler, *Lives of Saints*.

² June 8th. St. William. Was Bernard imposed upon, or the author of these calumnies? It is a dark page in his life.

³ Otho of Freisingen, however, ascribes two other tenets to Gilbert, one denying all human merit; the other, a peculiar opinion on baptism. "Quod meritum humanum attenuando, nullum mereri diceret præter Christum." He appeared too to deny that any one was really baptized, except those who were to be saved. — Otho Freisingen. i. 50. M. Haureau (*Philosophie Scolastique*) has a much higher opinion of Gilbert de la Porée as an original thinker than the historians of philosophy previous to him. — vol. i. c. xviii.

tilties they came to no conclusion. It was, in fact, in its main article, a mere dialectic dispute, bearing on the point whether the divine nature was God. It was Nominalism and Realism in another form. But the close of this contest demands attention. The Bishop of Poitiers, instead of shrinking from his own words, in a discussion before the Pope, who was now at Paris, exclaimed: — “Write them down with a pen of adamant!” Notwithstanding this, under the influence and direction of Bernard four articles were drawn and ratified by the Synod. The Pope himself, worn out, acknowledged that the controversy was beyond his understanding. These articles were the direct converse to those of Gilbert of Poitiers. They declared the divine nature to be God, and God the divine nature. But Rome heard with indignation that the Church of France had presumed to enact articles of faith. The Cardinals published a strong remonstrance impeaching the Pope of presumption; of abandoning the advice of his legitimate counsellors, who had promoted him to the Papacy; and yielding to the sway of private, of more recent friendship.¹ “It is not for thee alone, but for us with thee to frame articles of faith. Is this good Abbot to presume to dictate to Christendom? The Eastern churches would not have dared to do this.” The Pope endeavored to soothe them by language almost apologetic; they allowed themselves at length to be appeased by his modest words, but on condition that no

¹ The Bishop Otho of Freisingen writes thus of Bernard: “Erat autem prædictus Abbas, tam ex Christianæ religionis fervore zelotypus, quam ex habituali mansuetudine quodammodo credulus, ut et magistros, qui humanis rationibus, sæculari sapientiæ confisi, nimium inhærebant, abhorreret, et si quidquam ei Christianæ fidei absonum de talibus diceretur facile aurem præberet.” — *De Rebus Freder. I.*, i. 47.

symbol of faith should be promulgated without the authority of the Roman court, the College of Cardinals.

These, however, were trivial and unimportant considerations. Before and during the agitation of these contests, the whole soul of Bernard was absorbed in a greater object: he aspired to be a second Peter the Hermit, the preacher of a new crusade. The fall of Edessa, and other tidings of defeat and disaster, had awakened the slumbering ardor of Europe. The kingdom of Jerusalem trembled for its security. Peter himself was not more active or more successful in traversing Europe, and wakening the passionate valor of all orders, than Bernard. In the cities of Germany, of Burgundy, of Flanders, of France, the pulpits were open to him; he preached in the market-places and highways. Nor did he depend upon human eloquence alone: according to his wandering followers, eye-witnesses as they declared themselves, the mission of Bernard was attested by miracles, at least as frequent and surprising as all those of the Saviour, recorded in the New Testament. They, no doubt, imagined that they believed them, and no one hesitated to believe their report. In sermons, in speeches, in letters, by public addresses, and by his private influence, Bernard wrought up Latin Christendom to a second access of frenzy equal to the first.¹ The Pope, Eugenius III., probably at his instigation, addressed an animated epistle to Western Christendom. He promised the same privileges offered by his predecessor Urban, the remission of all sins, the protection of the crusaders' estates and families during their absence in the Holy Land under the tutelage of

¹ Epist. to the Pope Eugenius, 256; to the Bishop of Spires, 322.

the Church; and he warned them against profane luxury in their arms and accoutrements; against hawks and hounds, while engaged in that hallowed warfare. Bernard preached a sermon to the Knights Templars, now in the dawn of their valor and glory. The Koran is tame to this fierce hymn of battle. "The Christian who slays the unbeliever in the Holy War is sure of his reward, more sure if he is slain. The Christian glories in the death of the Pagan, because Christ is glorified: by his own death both he himself and Christ are still more glorified." Bernard at the Council of Vezelay wrought no less wonder-<sup>Easter, 1146.
Vezelay.</sup>ful effects than Pope Urban at Clermont. Eugenius alone, who had not yet crossed, or had hardly crossed the Alps, was wanting at that august assembly, but in a letter he had declared that nothing but the disturbances at Rome prevented him from following the example of his predecessor Urban. A greater than the Pope was there. The Castle of Vezelay could not contain the multitudes who thronged to hear the fervid eloquence of Bernard. The preacher, with the King of France Louis VII. by his side, who wore the cross conspicuously on his dress, ascended a platform of wood. At the close of his harangue the whole assembly broke out in tumultuous cries, "The Cross, the Cross!" They crowded to the stage to receive the holy badge; the preacher was obliged to scatter it among them, rather than deliver it to each. The stock at hand was soon exhausted. Bernard tore up his own dress to satisfy the eager claimants. For the first time, the two greatest sovereigns in Christendom, the Emperor and the King of France, embarked in the cause. Louis had appeared at Vezelay; he was taking measures for the

campaign. But Conrad shrank from the perilous enterprise ; the affairs of Germany demanded the unintermitting care of her sovereign. Bernard watched his opportunity. At a great Diet at Spires, at Christmas, after the reconciliation of some of the rebellious princes with the Empire, he urged both the Emperor and the princes, in a long and ardent sermon, to testify to their Christian concord by taking the Cross together. Three days after, at Ratisbon, he had a private interview with the Emperor. Conrad still wavered, promised to consult his nobles, and to give an answer on the following day. On that day, after the mass, Bernard ascended the pulpit. At the close of his sermon, he turned to the Emperor, and after a terrific description of the terrors of the Last Day, he summoned him to think of the great gifts, for which he would have to give account at that awful advent of the Lord. The Emperor and the whole audience melted into tears ; he declared himself ready to take the Cross : he was at once invested with the irrevocable sign of dedication to the holy warfare ; many of his nobles followed his example. Bernard, for all was prepared, took the consecrated banner from the altar, and delivered it into the hands of Conrad. Three bishops, Henry of Ratisbon, Otho of Freisingen, Reginbert of Padua, took the Cross. Such a multitude of thieves and robbers crowded to the sacred standard, that no one could refuse to see the hand of God.¹ Nowhere would even kings proceed without the special benediction of Bernard. At Etampes, and at St. Denys in the next year, he appeared among the assembled crusaders of France. The Pope Eugenius was now in France ; the King at

¹ Otho Freisingen, i. 40.

St. Denys prostrated himself before the feet of his Holiness and of Bernard; they opened a box of golden crucifixes; they led him to the altar ^{Pentecost, May 11, 1147} and bestowed on him the consecrated banner, the pilgrim's wallet and staff. At another meeting at Chartres, Bernard, so great was the confidence in his more than human powers, was entreated himself to take the command of the crusade. But he wisely remembered the fate of Peter's followers, and exhorted the warriors to place themselves under the command of some experienced general.

But there was a miracle of Christian love, as far surpassing in its undoubted veracity as in its evangelic beauty all which legend gathered around the preaching pilgrimage of Bernard. The crusade began; a wild monk named Rodolph raised the terrible cry against the Jews, which was even more greedily ^{The Jews.} than before heard by the populace of the great cities, and by the armed soldiers. In Cologne, Mentz, Spire, Worms, Strasburg, a massacre the most frightful and remorseless broke out. Bernard arose in all his power and authority. He condemned the unchristian act in his strongest language. "God had punished the Jews by their dispersion, it was not for man to punish them by murder." Bernard himself confronted the furious Rodolph at Mentz, and commanded him to retire to his convent; but it required all the sanctity and all the eloquence of Bernard to control the furious populace, now drunk with blood and glutted with pillage.¹ Among the most melancholy reflections, it is not the

¹ Otho Freisingen, i. 37, 8. It is curious that the two modern biographers of St. Bernard, Neander and M. de Ratisbonne, were once Jews. Their works are labors of gratitude as well as of love.

least sad that the gentle Abbot of Clugny, Peter the Venerable, still to be opposed to Bernard, took the side of blind fanaticism.

Of all these holy wars, none had been announced with greater ostentation, of none had it been more boldly averred that it was of divine inspiration, the work of God; of none had the hopes, the prophecies of success been more confident; none had been conducted with so much preparation and pomp; none had as yet been headed by kings — none ended in such total and deplorable disaster. So vast had been the movement, so completely had the West been drained to form the army of the Cross, that not merely had all war come to an end, but it was almost a crime, writes the warlike Bishop of Freisingen, to be seen in arms. “The cities and the castles are empty,” writes Bernard, “there is hardly one man to seven women.” What was the close? At least thirty thousand lives were sacrificed and there was not even the consolation of one glorious deed achieved. The Emperor, the King of France, returned to their dominions, the ignominious survivors of their gallant hosts! But would the general and bitter disappointment of Christendom, the widowed and orphaned houses, the families, scarcely one of which had not to deplore their head, their pride, their hope, or their stay, still respect the author of all these calamities? Was this the event of which Bernard had been the preacher, the prophet? Were all his miracles wrought only to plunge Christendom in shame and misery? There was a deep and sullen murmur against Bernard, and Bernard himself was prostrated for a time in profound depression. But this disappointment found its usual consolation. Ber-

nard still declared that he had spoken with the authority of the Pope, with the authority of God.¹ The first cause of failure was the perfidy of the Greeks. The Bishop of Langres had boldly advised the measure which was accomplished by a later crusade, the seizure of Constantinople; and with still more fervent hatred and contempt for the Greeks, whom they overwhelmed, starved, insulted on the passage through their dominions, the crusaders complained of their inhospitality, of the unchristian lukewarmness of their friendship. But the chief blame of their disasters was thrown back on the crusaders themselves; on the license and unchastity of their camp. God would not be served by soldiers guilty of such sins; sins which human prudence might have anticipated as the inevitable consequence of discharging upon a distant land undisciplined and uncontrolled hordes, all the ruffians and robbers of Europe, whose only penance was to be the slaughter of unbelievers.² The Pope wrote a letter of consolation, cold consolation, to the Emperor Conrad; the admirers of Bernard excuse him by condemning themselves. But the boldest tone of consolation was taken by a monk named John. Not only did he assure Bernard that he knew from Heaven that many who had died in the Holy Land died with joy because they were prevented from returning to the wicked world, but in private confession he averred that the patron saints of his monastery, St. Peter and St. John, had appeared and

¹ "Diximus pax et non est pax: promissimus bona et ecce turbatio . . . Cucurrimus planè in eo non quasi in incertum, sed te jubente et inò per te Deo." — See the whole passage, *De Consider.* ii. 1.

² "Quamvis si dicamus sanctum illum Abbatem spiritu Dei ad excitandos nos afflatum fuisse, sed nos ob superbiam, lasciviamque nostram . . . merito rerum personarumque dispendium deportasse," &c. — *Otho Freising.* i. 60.

submitted to be interrogated on this mournful subject. The Apostles declared that the places of many of the fallen angels had been filled up by the Christian warriors who had died for the Cross in the Holy Land. The Apostles had likewise a fervent desire for the presence of the holy Bernard among them.¹

Only a few years elapsed before Bernard, according A.D. 1153. to the general judgment of Christendom, fulfilled the vision of the monk, and departed to the society of Saints, Apostles, and Angels.

The Saint, the Philosopher, the Demagogue of the century have passed before us (the end of the last is to come): it may be well to contemplate also the high ecclesiastical statesman. Suger, Abbot of St. Denys, has been sometimes represented as the unambitious Richelieu, the more honest Mazarin of his Suger of St. Denys. age. But Suger was the Minister of Kings of France, whose realm in his youth hardly reached beyond four or five modern departments; whose power was so limited that the road between Paris and Orleans, their two great cities, was commanded by the castle of a rebellious noble.² But though the fame of Suger be unwisely elevated by such comparisons, the historic facts remain, that during the reigns of the two Kings, Louis the Fat, and Louis the Young, of whom Suger was the chief counsellor, order was restored, royal authority became more than a name, the great vassals of the crown were brought into something more nearly approaching to subordination. If France became France, and from the Meuse to the Pyrenees some respect and homage belonged to the King; if some cities obtained charters

¹ Bernardi Opera, Epist. 333.

² Sismondi, Hist. des Français, v. pp. 7-20.

of freedom ; however the characters of the Kings and the circumstances of the times may have had greater actual influence than the administration of Suger, yet much must have been due to his wisdom and firmness.

Suger was born of obscure parentage at St. Omer, in 1081. He was received at fifteen in the ^{His birth.}

Abbey of St. Denys. He became the companion of the King's son, educated at that abbey. In 1098 he went to finish his studies at St. Florent, in Saumur. He returned to St. Denys about the age of twenty-two.

In the wars of Louis, first named the Watchful,¹ an appellation ill-exchanged for that of the

Fat, the young monk of St. Denys scrupled ^{Education and early life}

not to wield a lance and to head the soldiers of the Abbey ; for the King's domains and those of the Abbey of St. Denys, as annoyed by common enemies, were bound in close alliance, and were nearly of the same extent ; the soldiers of St. Denys formed a large contingent in the royal army. The Abbot relates, not without some proud reminiscences, how, while yet a monk, he broke gallantly through the marauding hosts of Hugh de Poinset, and threw himself into Theury ; he describes the joy "of our men" at his unexpected appearance, which encouraged them to a des- ^{A.D. 1112.}

perate rally, and saved Theury, a post of the utmost importance, for the King. Suger became the ambassador of the two great powers, the King and the Abbot of St. Denys, to the Court of Rome. He was sent to welcome Pope Gelasius, when, after the death of Paschal, he fled to France. Yet he could not lament the death of Gelasius : the prudent Suger did not wish to

¹ L'Eveillé.

commit France in a quarrel with the Romans.¹ Suger hailed the elevation of the half-French Pope, Calixtus II. He went on the King's affairs to Rome; and followed Calixtus into Apulia. On his return he had a remarkable and prophetic vision, and woke to the re-Suger abbot. ality. On the death of Abbot Adam he had been chosen to the high place of Abbot of St. Denys. But the churchman and the courtier were committed in dire perplexity within him. The election had taken place without the King's permission. Louis, in fury, had committed the monks and knights of the Abbey to prison at Orleans. Should he brave the King's wrath, throw himself on the power of the Pope, and compel A.D. 1123. the King to submission? or was he tamely to surrender the rights of the Church? Louis, however, he found to his delight, had, after some thought, approved his election.

From that time Suger became the first counsellor, if not the minister of the king. The Abbey of St. Denys was the centre of the affairs of France. The restless, all-watchful piety of St. Bernard took alarm at this secularization of the holy foundation of St. Denys. He wrote a long, lofty rebuke to the abbot; he reproved St. Bernard. his temporal pomp, his temporal business. "The abbey was thronged, not with holy recluses in continual prayer within the chapel, or on their knees within their narrow cells, but with mailed knights; even arms were seen within the hallowed walls. If that which was of Cæsar was given to Cæsar, that of God was not given to God." Suger himself had never

¹ Les Nôtres. Suger, Vie de Louis le Gros, in Guizot's Mémoires. Siege of Theury. "Il avait ainsi, en quittant la vie épargné une querelle aux Français et aux Romains." — Ibid.

thrown off the severe monk : the king's minister lodged in a close cell, ten feet by fifteen ; he performed with punctilious austerity all the outward duties, he indulged in all the minute self-tortures of his cloister. Throughout the rest of the reign of Louis the Fat, and the commencement of that of Louis the Young, during which the kingly power was gradually growing up in strength and authority, Suger ruled in the king's councils. When the irresistible eloquence of St. Bernard¹ swept Louis the Young, with the rest of Europe, to the Holy Land, Suger alone had the courage to oppose the abandonment of the royal duties in this wild enterprise : he opposed in vain. Yet by the unanimous voice Suger remained for two years chief of the re-^{From 1147 to 1149.}gency ; the Archbishop of Rouen and the Count of Vermandois held but a secondary authority. On the return of the king, the regent abbot could appeal in honest pride to his master, whether he had not maintained the realm in unwonted peace (the more turbulent barons had no doubt accompanied the king to the Holy Land), supplied him with ample means in money, in warlike stores, in men ; his palaces and domains were in admirable state. The Regent yielded up his trust, the kingdom of France, in a better state than it had been during the reign of the Capets. Suger the statesman had endeavored to dissuade the king from the crusade, but from no want of profound religious zeal. In his old age, at seventy years, the Abbot of St. Denys himself proposed to embark on a crusade : he would consecrate all his own wealth ; he would persuade the bishops to devote their ample revenues to this holy cause ; and thus the Church might

¹ Read the whole of the 78th epistle. — Bernardi Opera.

conquer Jerusalem without loss or damage to the realm
JAN. 13, 1152. of France. Death cut short his holy design ;
he died the year before St. Bernard, who, notwithstanding
his rebuke, and the opposition to his views on the
Holy Land, admired and loved the Abbot of St. Denys.
It may be some further homage to the high qualities of
Abbot Suger (without exalting him beyond the narrow
sphere in which he moved), that after his death begins
the feeble and inglorious part of the reign of Louis
VII. — Louis himself sinks into a slave of superstition.
Suger was an historian as well as a statesman ; but he
administered better than he wrote ; though not without
some graphic powers, his history is somewhat pompous,
but without dignity ; it has many of the monkish fail-
ings without their occasional beauty and simplicity.¹

¹ See throughout Suger, *Vit. Louis Gr.*, and the *Life of Suger*, in *Latin*
in Bouquet, in French in Guizot's *Collection des Mémoires*.

CHAPTER VII.

HADRIAN IV.—FREDERICK BARBAROSSA.

IN the same year with Bernard died the friend of Bernard, the Cistercian Pope, Eugenius III. He had returned to Italy after the departure of the crusade. He took up his abode, not at Rome, but at first at Viterbo, afterwards at Tusculum. ^{Nov. 30, 1148.} There was a period of hostility, probably of ^{April 8, 1149.} open war, with the republic at Rome. But the temper or the policy of Eugenius led him to milder measures. The republic disclaimed not the spiritual su- ^{Nov. 23, 1149.} premacy of the Pope, and Eugenius scrupled not to enter the city only as its bishop, not as its Lord. The first time he remained not long, and retired into Campania; ¹ the second time, the year before ^{Dec. 9, 1152.} his death, the skilful and well-timed use of means more becoming the Head of Christendom than arms and excommunications, wrought wonders in his favor; by his gentleness, his lavish generosity, his magnificence (he built a palace near St. Peter's, another at Segni), and his charity, he was slowly supplanting the senate in the popular attachment; the fierce and in-

¹ He was at Alba, June; at Segni, October?; Ferentino, November, December, part of 1152. Then again at Segni. — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit. He is also said to have recovered some parts of the papal domains. From whom?

tractable people were yielding to this gentler influence.

Sept. 7,
1152.

Arnold of Brescia found his power gradually wasting away from the silent counter-working of the clergy, from the fickleness, perhaps the reasonable disappointment of the people, who yearned again for the glory and the advantage of being the religious capital of the world — the centre of pilgrimage, of curiosity, of traffic, of business, from all parts of the world. The Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz came in all their pomp and extravagance of expenditure to Rome; for the first time they were sent back with their treasures.¹ Eugenius, in the spirit of an ancient Roman, or a true Cistercian, refused their magnificent offerings, or rather their bribes. It may be questioned whether the republicans of Rome were the most sincere admirers of this unwonted contempt of riches shown by the Pope. The death of Eugenius alone preserved the republic from an earlier but less violent fate than it suffered at last.² He died at Tivoli, but his remains were received in Rome with the utmost respect, and buried in the Vatican. The fame of miraculous cures around his tomb showed how strong the Pope still remained in the affections and reverence of the common people.

July 7, 1153.
Death of
Eugenius.

The Republic, true to its principles, did not, like the turbulent Roman nobles, or the heads of factions in the former century, interfere, either by force or intrigue, in the election of the Popes. The cardinals quietly raised Conrad, Bishop of Sabina, a Roman by birth, to

¹ "Nova res. Quando hactenus aurum Roma refudit?" — Bernard. de Consid. iii. 3.

² "Et nisi esset mors æmula, quæ illum cito de medio rapuit, senatores noviter procreatos populi adminiculo usurpatâ dignitate privasset." — Rönwald Salern. in Chron.

the pontifical chair with the name of Anastasius IV. On the death of Anastasius, after, it should Dec. 2, 1154. seem a peaceful rule of one year and five Hadrian IV. Dec. 4. months, the only Englishman who ever filled the papal chair was raised to the supremacy over Christendom.

Nicolas Breakspeare, born, according to one account, at St. Alban's,¹ wandered forth from his country in search of learning; he was received into a monastery at Arles; became a brother, prior, abbot. He went to Rome on the affairs of his community, and so won the favor of the Pope Eugenius that he was detained in his court, was raised to the cardinalate, undertook a mission as legate to Norway,² and, something in the character of the old English apostles of Germany, confirmed that hard won kingdom in its allegiance to the see of Rome. Nicolas Breakspeare was a man of exemplary morals, high fame for learning, and great eloquence: and now the poor English scholar, homeless, except in the home which he found in the hospitable convent; friendless, except among the friends which he has made by his abilities, his virtues, and his piety; with no birth or connections to advance his claims; is become the Head of Christendom — the Lord of Rome, which surrenders her liberties before his feet — the Pontiff from whose hands the mightiest and proudest

¹ Cardinal Arragon in Vitâ. He was Bishop of Alba. Perhaps the notion of his birth at St. Alban's arose from his being called Albanus.

² Norway was slowly converted, not by preachers or bishops, but by her kings; by Harold the Fair-haired, Hacon Athelstan, Olaf Trigvesen — Saint Olaf — not with apostolic persuasion, but with the Mohammedan proselytism of the sword. And a strange, wild Christianity it was, worthy of its origin; but it softened down by degrees into Christianity. — See Bishop Munter, *Einführung des Christenthums in Dänemark und Norwegen*, latter part of vol. i.

Emperor is glad to receive his crown! What pride, what hopes, might such a promotion awaken in the lowest of the sacerdotal order throughout Christendom! In remote England not a youthful scholar but may have had visions of pontifical grandeur! This had been at all times wonderful, how much more so in the age of feudalism, in which the pride of birth was paramount!

Nor did Hadrian IV. yield to any of his loftiest predecessors in his assertion of the papal dignity; he was surpassed by few in the boldness and courage with which he maintained it. The views of unlimited power which opened before the new pontiff appear most manifestly in his grant of Ireland to Henry II. of England. English pride might mingle with sacerdotal ambition in this boon of a new kingdom to his native sovereign. The language of the grant developed principles as yet unheard in Christendom. The Popes had assumed the feudal sovereignty of Naples and Sicily, as in some vague way the successors to the power of Imperial Rome. But Hadrian declared that Ireland and all islands converted to Christianity belonged to the special jurisdiction of St. Peter.¹ He assumed the right of sanctioning the invasion, on the ground of its advancing civilization and propagating a purer faith among the barbarous and ignorant people. The tribute of Peter's pence from the conquered island was to be the reward of the Pope's munificence in granting the island to the English, and his

¹ "Sanè Hiberniam et omnes insulas, quibus Sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ receperunt, ad jus B. Patri et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit, non est dubium pertinere." — Rymer, *Fœdera*, i. 19; Wilken, *Concil.* i. 426; Radulf de Diceto.

recognition of Henry's sovereignty. The prophetic ambition of Hadrian might seem to have anticipated the time, when on such principles the Popes should assume the power of granting away new worlds.

But Hadrian had first to bring rebellious Rome under his sway. The mild measures of Pope Eugenius had undermined the power of Arnold of Brescia. Hadrian had the courage to confront him with open hostility. He vouchsafed no answer to the haughty demands of the republic to recognize its authority; he pronounced sentence of banishment from the city against Arnold himself. Arnold denied the power of the Pope to issue such sentence. But an opportunity soon occurred in which Hadrian, without exceeding his spiritual power, bowed the whole rebellious people under his feet. The Cardinal of San Pudenziana, on his way to the Pope, who was in the palace raised on the Vatican by Eugenius III., encountered a tumult of the populace, and received a mortal wound. Hadrian instantly placed the whole city under an interdict. Rome under interdict. Rome for the first time was deprived of all its religious ceremonies. No procession moved through the silent streets; the people thronged around the closed doors of the churches; the clergy, their functions entirely suspended, had nothing to do but to inflame the minds of the populace. Easter, March 27, 1155. Easter was drawing on; no mass could atone for, no absolution release them from their sins. Religion triumphed over liberty. The clergy and the people compelled the senate to yield. Hadrian would admit of no lower terms than the abrogation of the republican institutions; the banishment of Fall of the Republic. Arnold and his adherents. The republic was at an

end, Arnold an exile; the Pope again master in Rome.

But all this time great events were passing in the north of Italy; events which, however in some respects menacing to Pope Hadrian, might encourage him in his inflexible hostility to the republicans of Rome.¹ On the death of Conrad, Germany with one consent had placed the crown on the head of the great Hohenstaufen prince, his nephew, Frederick Barbarossa. If the Papacy under Hadrian had resumed all its haughty authority, the Empire was wielded with a terrible force, which it had hardly ever displayed before. Frederick was a prince of intrepid valor, consummate prudence, unmeasured ambition, justice which hardened into severity, the ferocity of a barbarian somewhat tempered with a high chivalrous gallantry; above all with a strength of character which subjugated alike the great temporal and ecclesiastical princes of Germany; and was prepared to assert the imperial rights in Italy to the utmost. Of the constitutional rights of the Emperor, of his unlimited supremacy, his absolute independence of, his temporal superiority over, all other powers, even that of the Pope, Frederick proclaimed the loftiest notions. He was to the Empire what Hildebrand and Innocent were to the popedom. His power was of God alone; to assert that

¹ Compare the curious account given by John of Salisbury of conversations with Pope Hadrian, with whom, on account probably of his English connections; he may have been on intimate terms. The condition of the Pope is most laborious, is most miserable. "Si enim avaritiæ servit, mors ei est. Sin autem, non effugiat manus et linguas Romanorum. Nisi enim noscat unde obstruat eorum ora manusque cohibeat, ad flagitia et sacrilegia perferenda omnes oculos duret et animam . . . nisi servirent, aut ex-Pontificem, aut ex-Romanum esse necesse est." — Polycratic. L. viii. p. 324 and 366, edit. Giles.

it is bestowed by the successor of St. Peter was a lie, and directly contrary to the doctrine of St. Peter.¹

In the autumn of the year of Hadrian's accession Frederick descended the Alps by the valley of Trent. Never had a more imposing might assembled around any of his predecessors than around Frederick on the plains of Roncaglia. He came to receive the iron crown of Italy from the Lombards, the End of November, 1154. imperial crown from the Pope at Rome. He had summoned all the feudatories of the Empire, all the feudatories of Italy, to his banner, declaring himself determined to enforce the forfeiture of their fiefs if they refused to obey. The Bishops of Crema and of Halberstadt were deprived, as contumacious, for their lives, of their temporalities.² The great prelates of Germany, instead of fomenting disturbances in the Empire, were in the army of Frederick. The Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz were at the head of their vassals. The Lombard cities, most of which had now become republics, hastened to send their deputies to acknowledge their fealty. The Marquis of Montferrat appeared, it is said, the only ruling prince in the north of Italy. Pavia, Genoa, Lodi, Crema, vied in their loyalty; even haughty Milan, which had trampled under foot Frederick's mandate commanding peace with Lodi,

¹ "Quum per electionem principum a solo Deo regnum et imperium nostrum sit, qui in passione Christi filii sui duobus gladiis necessariis regendum orbem subiecit, quumque Petrus Apostolus hac doctrinâ mundum informaverit: Deum time, regem honorificate; quicumque nos imperialem coronam pro beneficio a domino Papa suscepisse dixerit, divinæ institutioni et doctrinæ Petri contrarius est et mendacii reus est." — Otho Freisingen, apud Muratori, vi. 709. Compare Eichhorn on the Constitution of the Empire, from the Swabische Spiegel and the Sachsische Spiegel, ii. pp. 364, *et seq.*

² Muratori, Ann. d'Italia sub ann.

sent her consuls.¹ The Duke Guelf of Bavaria, under the protection of the Emperor, took quiet possession of the domains of the Countess Matilda;² it was no time for the Pope even to enter a protest. Frederick appeared with the iron crown in the Church of St. Michael at Pavia.³ There was just resistance enough to show the terrible power, the inflexible determination of Frederick. At the persuasion of faithful Pavia, Frederick laid siege to Tortona: notwithstanding the bravest resistance, the city fell through famine and thirst.⁴ Frederick now directed his march to the south.

Hadrian had watched all the movements of Frederick with jealous apprehension. The haughty King had not yet declared his disposition towards the Church; nor was it known with certainty whether he would take part with the people of Rome, or with their Pontiff. Hadrian was at Viterbo with the leaders of his party, the Frangipani, and Peter the prefect of the city. He sent forward an embassy of three cardinals, St. John and St. Paul, St. Pudenziana, St. Maria in Portico, who met Frederick at San Quirico. Among the first articles which the Pope enforced on the Emperor as the price of his coronation was the surrender of Arnold of Brescia into his hands. The Emperor and the Pope were united by the bonds of common interest and common dread and hatred of republicanism. Hadrian wanted the aid of Frederick to suppress the still powerful and now rallying faction in Rome.

¹ Von Raumer, p. 18; *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, viii. 8.

² Frederick's first descent into Italy is fully and clearly related by Von Raumer.

³ April 17, 1155. Muratori, sub ann.

⁴ Gunther, iii.; Otho Freisingen, ii. 20.

Frederick received the Imperial crown from the hands of the Pope to ratify his unlimited sovereignty over the contumacious cities of Lombardy. Arnold of Brescia had struck boldly at both powers; he utterly annulled the temporal supremacy of the Pope; and if he acknowledged, reduced the sovereignty of the Emperor to a barren title.¹ To a man so merciless ^{Seizure and execution of} and contemptuous of human life as Barba-rossa, the sacrifice of a turbulent demagogue, guilty of treason alike to the temporal and spiritual power, was a light thing indeed. Arnold had fled from Rome, doubtful and irresolute as to his future course; his splendid dreams had vanished, the faithless soil had crumbled under his feet. In Otricoli he had met Gerhard, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, who took him prisoner. He had been rescued by some one of the viscounts of Campania, his partisans, perhaps nobles, who held papal estates by grants from the republic. By them he was honored as a prophet.² Frederick sent his officers, who seized one of these Campanian nobles and compelled the surrender of Arnold: he was carried to Rome, committed to the custody of Peter, prefect of the city, who held for the Pope the castle of St. Angelo. No time was to be lost. He had been, even till within a short time, an object of passionate attachment to the people; there might be an insurrection of the people for his rescue. If he were reserved for the arrival of

1 "Nil juris in hac re
Pontifici summo, *modicum* concedere regi
Suadebat populo: sic læsâ stultus utrâque.
Majestate, reum geminæ se præbuit aulæ."

Gunther, iii. 383.

2 "Tanquam prophetam in terrâ suâ cum omni honore habebant." —
Acta Hadriani in Cod. Vaticano apud Baronium.

Frederick at Rome, what change might be wrought by his eloquence before the Imperial tribunal, by the offers of his republican friends, by the uncertain policy of Frederick, who might then consider the demagogue an useful control upon the Pope! The Church took upon itself the summary condemnation, the execution, of the excommunicated rebel. The execution was despatched with such haste, perhaps secrecy, that even at the time various rumors as to the mode and place of punishment were spread abroad. In one point alone all are agreed, that Arnold's ashes, lest the foolish people should worship the martyr of their liberties, were cast into the Tiber.¹ The Church had been wont to call in the tem-

¹ Sismondi, whom Von Raumer has servilely followed, gives a dramatic description of the execution before the Porta del Popolo; of Arnold looking down all the three streets which converge from that gate; of the sleeping people awakened by the tumult of the execution, and the glare of the flames from the pile on which his remains were burned, rising too late to the rescue, and gathering the ashes as relics. All this is pure fiction: neither the Cardinal of Arragon, nor Otho of Freisingen, nor Gunther, nor the wretched verses of Godfrey of Viterbo, have one word of it. Gunther and Otho of Freisingen affix him to a cross, and burn him.

*"Judicio cleri nostro sub principe victus,
Adpensusque cruci, flammâque cremante solutus
In cineres, Tiberine, tuas est sparsus in undas.
Ne stolidæ plebis, quem fecerat, improbus error,
Martyris ossa novo cineresve foveret honore."*

Gunther.

Anselm of Gemblours and Godfrey of Viterbo say that he was hanged. Gunther may mean by his *crux* a simple gallows: "*Strangulat hunc laqueus, ignis et unda velunt.*" But the most remarkable account is that of Gerohus de Investigatione Antichristi (on Gerohus see Fabricius, Bibliotheca Lat. Med. Ætat. iii. p. 47): "*Arnoldus pro doctrinâ suâ non solum ab ecclesiâ Dei anathematis mucrone separatus insuper etiam suspendio neci traditus atque in Tyberim projectus est, ne videlicet Romanus populus, quem suâ doctrinâ illexerat, sibi eum martyrem dedicaret. Quem ego vellem pro tali doctrinâ suâ, quamvis pravâ, vel exilio, vel carcere, aut aliâ pœnâ præter mortem punitum esse, vel saltem taliter occisum, ut Romana Ecclesia seu curia ejus necis quæstione careret.*" The whole remark-

poral sword to shed the blood of man; the capital punishment of Arnold was, by the judgment of the clergy, executed by the officer of the Pope; even some devout churchmen shuddered when they could not deny that the blood of Arnold of Brescia was on the Church.

The sacrifice of human life had been offered; but the treaty which it was to seal between the Emperor and the Pope was delayed by mutual suspicion. Their embassies had led to misunderstanding and jealousy. Hadrian was alarmed at the haughty tone, the hasty movements of Frederick; he could not be ignorant that at the news of his advance to Rome the republicans had rallied and sent proposals to the Emperor; he could not but conjecture the daring nature of those propositions. He would not trust himself in the power of Frederick; as the German advanced towards Rome Hadrian continued to retire. The deputation from the Roman republic encountered Barbarossa on the Roman side of Sutri. Their lofty language showed how deeply and completely they were intoxicated with the doctrines of Arnold of Brescia: they seemed fondly to hope that they should find in Frederick a more powerful Arnold; that by some scanty concessions of title and honor they should hardly yield up their independence upon the Empire and secure entirely their independence of the Pope.¹ They congratulated Frederick on his arrival in the neighborhood of Rome, if he came in peace, and with the intent to deliver them forever from the degrading yoke of the clergy. They ascribed all the old Roman glory, the

Romans meet Frederick.

able passage in Franke *Arnold von Brescia*, p. 193, and Nicolini's *Notes* p. 375.

¹ *Otho Freisingen*, ii. 22. *Gunther*, iii. 450.

conquest of the world, to the senate of Rome, of whom they were the representatives; they intimated that it was condescension on their part to bestow the imperial crown on a Transalpine stranger — “that which is ours of right we grant to thee;” they commanded him to respect their ancient institutions and laws, to protect them against barbarian violence, to pay five thousand pounds of silver to their officers as a largess for their acclamations in the Capitol, to maintain the republic even by bloodshed, to confirm their privileges by a solemn oath and by the Imperial signature. Frederick suppressed for a time his kingly, contemptuous indignation. He condescended in a long harangue to relate the transference of the Roman Empire to Charlemagne and his descendants. At its close he turned fiercely round. “Look at my Teutonic nobles, my banded chivalry. These are the patricians, these are the true Romans: this is the senate invested in perpetual authority. To what laws do you presume to appeal but those which I shall be pleased to enact? Your only liberty is to render allegiance to your sovereign.”

The crest-fallen republicans withdrew in brooding indignation and wounded pride to the city. It was now the turn of Hadrian to ascertain what reception
June 9. he would meet with from the Emperor. From Nepi Hadrian rode to the camp of Frederick in the territory of Sutri. He was met with courteous respect by some of the German nobles, and escorted towards the royal tent. But he waited in vain for the Emperor to come forth and hold his stirrup as he alighted from his horse.¹ The affrighted cardinals turned back, and did not rest till they reached Civita Castellana. The

¹ Otho Freisingen, ii. 21. Helmold, i. 80.

Pope remained with a few attendants and dismounted : then came forth Frederick, bowed to kiss his feet, and offered himself to receive the kiss of peace. The intrepid Pope refused to comply till the king should have shown every mark of respect usual from former emperors to his predecessors : he withdrew from before the tent. The dispute lasted the whole following day. Frederick at last allowed himself to be persuaded by the precedents alleged, and went to Nepi, where the Pope had pitched his camp. The Emperor dismounted, held the stirrup of Hadrian, and assisted him to alight.¹ Their common interests soon led at least to outward amity. The coronation of Frederick as Em-
 peror by the Pope could not but give great ^{June 11, 1155.} weight to his title in the estimation of Christendom, and Hadrian's unruly subjects could only be controlled by the strong hand of the Emperor. By the advice of Hadrian Frederick made a rapid march, ^{June 18.} took possession of the Leonine city and the church of St. Peter. The next day he was met on the steps of the church by the Pope, and received the ^{Coronation of the Emperor.} crown from his hands amid the acclamations of the army. The Romans on the other side of the Tiber were enraged beyond measure at their total exclusion from all assent or concern in the coronation. They had expected and demanded a great largess ; they had not even been admitted as spectators of the pompous ceremony. They met in the Capitol, crossed the bridge, endeavored to force their passage to St. Peter's, and slew a few of the miserable attendants whom they

¹ "Imperator — descendit eo viso de equo, et officium stratoris implevit et streugam ipsius tenuit, et tunc primo eum ad osculum dominus Papa recepit." — Cod. Ceneii. Carn. apud Muratori, *Antiquit.*, M. A. i. 117.

found on their way. But Frederick was too watchful a soldier to be surprised : the Germans met them, slew 1000, took 200 prisoners, whom he released on the interposition of the Pope.¹

But want of provisions compelled the Emperor to retire with the Pope to Tivoli ; there, each in their apparel of state, the Pope celebrated mass and gave the Holy Eucharist to the Emperor on St. Peter's day. The inhospitable climate began to make its usual ravages in the German army : Frederick, having achieved his object, after the capture and sacking of Spoleto, and some negotiations with the Byzantine ambassadors, retired beyond the Alps.²

Hadrian was thus, if abandoned by the protecting power, relieved from the importunate presence of the Emperor. The rebellious spirit of Rome seemed to have been crushed ; the temporal sovereignty restored to the Pope. He began again to bestow kingdoms, and by such gifts to bind to his interests the old allies of the pontificate more immediately at hand³ — allies, if his Roman subjects should break out into insurrection, if less powerful, more submissive than the Imperialists. Hadrian had at first maintained, he now abandoned, the cause of the barons of Apulia, who were in arms against the King of Sicily. His first act had been to excommunicate that king :

Hadrian's alliance with King of Sicily.

¹ The Bishop is seized with a fit of martial enthusiasm, and expresses vividly the German contempt for the Romans. "*Cerneret nostros tam immaniter quam audacter Romanos cædendo sternere, sternendo cædere, ac si dicerent, accipe nunc Roma pro auro Arabico Teutonicum ferrum. Hæc est pecunia quam tibi princeps tuus pro tuâ offert coronâ. Sic emitur a Francis Imperium.*" — Otho Freisingen, ii. 22.

² He was in Verona early in Sept. — Von Raumer, Reg., p. 531.

³ At St. Germano (Oct. 1155) he had received the homage of Robert Prince of Capua, and the other princes. — Cardin. Arragon. *l. cit*

now, at Benevento, William received from the hands of the Pope the investiture of the kingdom of Sicily, of the dukedom of Apulia, of the prin-^{June 9, 1156.} cipalities of Capua, Naples, Salerno and Amalfi, and some other territories. William bound himself to fealty to the Pope, to protect him against all his enemies, to pay a certain tribute annually for Apulia and Calabria, and for the March.

The Emperor Frederick had aspired to be as absolute over the whole of Italy as of Germany. Hadrian had even entered into an alliance with him against Sicily; the invasion of that kingdom had only been postponed on account of the state of the Imperial army and the necessary retirement of the Emperor beyond the Alps. In this Sicilian alliance Frederick saw at once treachery, ingratitude, hostility.¹ It betrayed a leaning to Italian independence, the growth and confederation with Rome of a power inimical to his own. William of Sicily had overrun the whole kingdom of Apulia; it was again Italian: yet fully occupied by the affairs of Germany, the Emperor's only revenge was an absolute prohibition to all German Ecclesiastics to journey to Rome, to receive the confirmation of their ecclesiastical dignities, or on any other affairs. This measure wounded the pride of Rome; it did more, it impoverished her. It cut off a large part of that revenue which she drew from the whole of Christendom. The haughty jealousy betrayed by this arbitrary act was aggravated by a singular incident. Frederick was holding a Diet of more than usual^{Diet at Besançon. Oct. 24, 1157.} magnificence at Besançon; he was there asserting his sovereignty over another of the kingdoms of Charle-

¹ Marangoni Chronic. Pisan. (Archivio Storico, vol. vi. p. 2), p. 16

magne, that of Burgundy. From all parts of the world, from Rome, Apulia, Venice, Lombardy, France, England, and Spain, persons were assembled, either for curiosity or for traffic, to behold the pomp of the new Charlemagne, or to profit by the sumptuous expenditure of the Emperor and his superb magnates. The legates of the Pope, Roland the Chancellor Cardinal of St. Mark, and Bernard Cardinal of St. Clement, presented themselves; they were received with courtesy. The letters which they produced were read and interpreted by the Chancellor of the Empire. Even the opening address to the Emperor was heard with some astonishment. "The Pope and the cardinals of the Roman Church salute you; he as a father, they as brothers." The imperious tone of the letter agreed with this beginning. It reproved the Emperor for his culpable negligence in not immediately punishing some of his subjects who had waylaid and imprisoned the Swedish Bishop of Lunden on his journey to Rome; it reminded Frederick of his favorable reception by the Pope in Italy, and that the Pope had bestowed on him the Imperial crown. "The Pope had not repented of his munificence nor would repent, even if he had bestowed greater favors." The ambiguous word used for favors, "*beneficia*," was taken in its feudal sense by the fierce and ignorant nobles. They supposed it meant that the Empire was held as a fief from the Pope. Those who had been at Rome remembered the arrogant lines which had been placed under the picture of the Emperor Lothair at the feet of the Pope, doing homage to him as his vassal.¹ Indignant mur-

Conduct of
Papal legates.

¹ "Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores,
Post homo fit Papæ, sumit quo dante coronam."

murs broke from the assembly ; the strife was exasperated by the words of the dauntless Cardinal Roland, " Of whom, then, does he hold the Empire but of our Lord the Pope ? " The Count Palatine, Otho of Witlesbach, drew his sword to cut down the audacious ecclesiastic. The authority of Frederick with difficulty appeased the tumult and saved the lives of the legates. Frederick, in a public manifesto, appealed to the Empire against the insolent pretensions of the Pope.¹ He accused Hadrian of wantonly stirring up hostility between the Church and the Empire. His address asserted (no doubt to bind the Transalpine clergy to his cause) that blank billets had been found on the legates empowering them to despoil the churches of the Empire and to carry away their treasures, even their sacred vessels and crosses, to Rome.² He issued an edict prohibiting the clergy from all access to the apostolic see, and gave instructions that the frontiers should be carefully watched lest any of them should find their way to Rome. Hadrian published an address to the bishops of the Empire, bitterly complaining of the blasphemies uttered by the Chancellor Rainald and the Count Pala-

¹ Radevic. i. 8, 19. Gunther, vi. 800. Concil. sub ann. 1157.

" Jam non ferro crucem domini, sed tradere regna
Gaudet, et Augustus mavult quam præsul haberi! "

Gunther.

So taunted Frederick the ambition of the Pope.

² " Porro quia multa paria litterarum apud eos reperta sunt, et schedulæ sigillatæ ad arbitrium eorum adhuc scribendæ (sicut hactenus consuetudinis eorum fuit) per singulas ecclesias Teutonici regni conceptum iniquitatis suæ virus respergere, altaria denudare, vasa domûs Dei asportare, cruces excoriare nitebantur. " This charge appears in the Rescript of Frederick in Radevicus. If untrue, it boldly calculated on as much ignorance in his clergy, as had been shown by the laity. But what was the ground of the charge? Some taxation, ordinary or extraordinary, of the clergy? — Radevic. Chron. apud Pistorium, i. 10.

tine against the legates, of the harsh proceedings of the Emperor, but without disclaiming the ambiguous sense of the offensive word ; he claimed their loyal support for the successor of St. Peter and the holy Roman Church. But the bishops had now for the most part become German princes rather than papal churchmen. They boldly declared, or at least assented to the Emperor's declaration of the supremacy of the Empire over the Church, demanded that the offensive picture of Lothair doing homage to the Pope should be effaced, the insulting verses obliterated.¹ They even hinted their disapprobation of Hadrian's treaty with the King of Sicily, and in respectful but firm language entreated the Pope to assume a more gentle and becoming tone.

The triumphant progress of Frederick's ambassadors, Rainald the Chancellor of the Empire and Otho Palatine of Bavaria, through Northern Italy, with the formidable preparations for the Emperor's own descent during the next year, had no doubt more effect in bringing back the Pope to less unseemly conduct. In the camp at Augsburg appeared the new legates, the Cardinal of St. Nireus and Achillas, and the Cardinal Hyacinth (who had been seized, plundered, and imprisoned by some petty chieftains in the Tyrol). They had authority to explain away the doubtful terms, to disclaim all pretensions on the part of the Pope to consider the Empire a benefice of the Church, or to make a grant of the Empire. Frederick accepted the overtures, and an outward reconciliation took place.

The next year Frederick descended for the second time into Italy. Never had so powerful a Teutonic

¹ Radevic. ii. 31.

army, not even in his first campaign, crossed the Alps. The several roads were choked by the contingents from every part of the Empire ; all Germany seemed to be discharging itself upon the plains of Italy. The Dukes of Austria and Carinthia descended the pass of Friuli ; Duke Frederick of Swabia, the Emperor's nephew, by Chiavenna and the Lake of Como ; Duke Bernard of Zahringen by the Great St. Bernard ; the Emperor himself marched down the valley of Trent, July, 1158.

At first his successes and his cruelties carried all before him. He compelled the submission of Milan ; the haughty manner in which he asserted the Imperial rights, the vast army with which he enforced those rights, the merciless severity with which he visited all treasonable resistance, seemed to threaten the ruin of all which remained either of the temporal or spiritual independence of Italy.¹ He seemed determined, he avowed his determination, to rule the clergy like all the rest of his subjects ; to compel their homage for all their temporal possessions ; to exact all the Imperial dues, to be, in fact as well as in theory, their feudal sovereign. He enforced the award already made of the inheritance of the Countess Matilda to his uncle Guelf VI. of Bavaria.

Slight indications betrayed the growing jealousy and alienation of the Emperor and the Pope. ^{Jealousy of Emperor and Pope.} These two august sovereigns seemed to take delight in galling each other by petty insults, but each of these insults had a deeper significance.² Guido, of a noble German house, the Counts of Blandrada, was elected, if through the imperial interest yet according

¹ Radevic. i. 26. Gunther, vii. 220. Almost all the German chronicles

² Radevic. ii. 15, 20. Gunther, ix. 115.

Nov. 24,
1158.

to canonical forms, to the Archiepiscopate of Ravenna, once the rival, now next to Rome in wealth and state. Guido was subdeacon of the Roman Church, and Hadrian refused to permit the translation, under the courteous pretext that he could not part with so beloved a friend, whose promotion in the Church of Rome was his dearest object. Hadrian soon after sent a letter to the Emperor, couched in moderate language, but complaining with bland bitterness of disrespect shown to his legates; of the insolence of the imperial troops, who gathered forage in the Papal territories and insulted the castles of the Pope; of the exaction of the same homage from bishops and abbots as from the cities and nobles of Italy. This letter was sent by a common, it was said a ragged messenger, who disappeared without waiting for an answer. The Emperor revenged himself by placing his own name in his reply before that of the Pope, and by addressing him in the familiar singular instead of the respectful plural, a style which the Popes had assumed when addressing the Emperor, and which Frederick declared to be an usurpation on their part.¹ Hadrian's next let-

Letter of
Hadrian.

ter showed how deep the wound had sunk. "The law of God promises long life to those who honor, threatens death to those who speak evil of their father and their mother. He that exalteth himself shall be abased. My son in the Lord (such is the endearing name which Hadrian uses to convict the Emperor of a breach of the divine commandment), we wonder at your irreverence. This mode of address incurs the guilt of insolence, if not of arrogance. What shall I say of the fealty sworn to St. Peter and

¹ Appendix ad Radev. 562.

to us? How dost thou show it? By demanding homage of bishops, who are Gods, and the Saints of the Most High; thou that makest them place their consecrated hands in yours! Thou that closest not merely the churches, but the cities of thy empire against our legates! We warn thee to be prudent. If thou hast deserved to be consecrated and crowned by our hands, by seeking more than we have granted, thou mayest forfeit that which we have condescended to grant." This was not language to soften a temper like Frederick's: his rejoinder rises to scorn and defiance. He reminds the Pope of the humble relation of Answer of Frederick. A.D. 1159. Sylvester to Constantine; all that the Popes possess is of the gracious liberality of the Emperors. He reverts to higher authority, and significantly alludes to the tribute paid by our Lord himself, through St. Peter, to Cæsar. "The churches are closed, the city gates will not open to the Cardinals, because they are not preachers, but robbers; not peacemakers, but plunderers; not the restorers of the world, but greedy rakers up of gold.¹ When we shall see them, as the Church enjoins, bringing peace, enlightening the land, maintaining the cause of the lowly in justice, we shall not hesitate to provide them with fitting entertainment and allowances." — "We cannot but return such answer when we find that detestable monster 'pride' to have crept up to the very chair of St. Peter. As ye are for peace, so may ye prosper."²

¹ "Quod non videmus eos prædicatores sed prædatores, non pacis corroboratores sed pecuniæ raptore, non orbis reparatores sed auri insatiabiles corrasores." — Append. Radevic.

² "Non enim non possumus respondere auditis, cum superbiæ detestabilem bestiam usque ad sedem Petri reptasse videmus. Paci bene consuientes bene semper valete." — Apud Baronium, sub ann. 1159.

Some of the German bishops, especially Eberhard of Bamberg, endeavored to mediate and avert the threatened conflict. The Emperor consented to receive four Cardinals. They brought a pacific proposition, but accompanied with demands which amounted to hardly less than the unqualified surrender of the Imperial rights. Terms proposed by the Pope. I. The first involved the absolute dominion of the city of Rome. The Emperor was to send no officer to act in his name within the city without permission of the Pope; the whole magistracy of the city and all the royalties being the property of the Apostolic See. II. No forage was to be levied in the Papal territories, excepting on occasion of the Emperor's coronation. His armies were thus prohibited from crossing the Papal frontier. III. The Bishops of Italy were to swear allegiance, but not do homage to the Emperor. IV. The ambassadors of the Emperor were not to be lodged of right in the episcopal palaces. V. The possessions of the Church of Rome to be restored, the whole domains of the Countess Matilda, the territory from Acquapendente to Rome, the Duchy of Spoleto, and the islands of Corsica and Sardinia; the Emperor to pay tribute for Ferrara, Massa, Fico- loro.

Frederick commanded his temper: such grave matters, he said, required the advice of his wisest counselors; but on some points he would answer at once. He would require no homage of the bishops if they would give up the fiefs which they held of the Empire. If they chose to listen to the Pope when he demanded what they had to do with the Emperor, they must submit to the commands of the Emperor, or what had they to do with the estates of the Empire? He would not

require that his ambassadors should be lodged in the episcopal palaces when those palaces stood on their own lands ; if they stood on the lands of the Empire, they were imperial, not episcopal palaces. “ For the city of Rome, by the grace of God I am Emperor of Rome : if Rome be entirely withdrawn from my authority, the Empire is an idle name, the mockery of a title.” Nor were these the only subjects of altercation. The Emperor complained of the intrusion of the Papal Legates into the Empire without his permission, the abuse of appeals, the treaties of the Pope with the Greek Empire and with the King of Sicily ; above all, his clandestine dealings with the insurgents, now in arms in Lombardy. He significantly intimated that if he could not make terms with the Pope, he might with the Senate and people of Rome.

Peace became more hopeless. As a last resource, six Cardinals on the part of the Pope, and six German Bishops on that of the Emperor, were appointed to frame a treaty. But the Pope demanded the reëstablishment of the compact made with his predecessor Eugenius. The Imperial Bishops reproached the Pope with his own violation of that treaty by his alliance with the King of Sicily ; the Germans unanimously rejected the demands of the Pope : and now the Emperor received with favor a deputation Firmness of Hadrian. from the Senate and people of Rome. These ambassadors of the Republican party had watched, had been present at the rupture of the negotiations.¹ The Pope, with the embers of Arnold's rebellion smouldering

¹ “ Præsentes ibidem fuere Romanorum civium legati, qui cum indignatione mirabantur super his quæ audierant.” — Epist. Eberhard Bamberg ap. Radevicum, ii. 31.

under his feet ; with the Emperor at the head of all Germany, the prelates as well as the princes ; with no ally but the doubtful, often perfidious Norman ; stood unshaken, betrayed no misgivings. To the Emperor no reply from the Pope appears ; but to the Archbishops of Treves, Mentz, and Cologne, was sent, or had before been sent, an invective against the Emperor, almost unequalled in scorn, defiance, and unmeasured assertion of superiority. There is no odious name in the Old Testament — Rabshakeh, Achitophel — which is not applied to Frederick. “ Glory be to God in the highest, that ye are found tried and faithful (he seems to reckon on their disloyalty to Frederick), while these flies of Pharaoh, which swarmed up from the bottom of the abyss, and, driven about by the whirling winds while they strive to darken the sun, are turned to the dust of the earth.” He threatens the Emperor with a public excommunication : “ And take ye heed that ye be not involved in the sins of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin ; and behold a worse than Jeroboam is here. Was not the Empire transferred by the Popes from the Greeks to the Teutons ? The King of the Teutons is not Emperor before he is consecrated by the Pope. Before his consecration he is but King ; after it Emperor and Augustus. From whence, then, the Empire but from us ? Remember what were these Teutonic Kings before Zacharias gave his benediction to Charles, the second of that name, who were drawn in a wagon by oxen, like philosophers !¹ Glorious kings, who dwelt, like the chiefs of synagogues, in these wagons, while the Mayor of the Palace administered the affairs of the Empire. Zacharias I. pro-

¹ “ Qui in carpento boum, sicut *philosophi* circumferebantur.”

moted Charles to the Empire, and gave him a name great above all names. . . . That which we have bestowed on the faithful German we may take away from the disloyal German. Behold it is in our power to grant to whom we will. For this reason are we placed above nations and kingdoms, that we may destroy and pluck up, build and plant. So great is the power of Peter, that whatsoever is done by us worthily and rightfully must be believed to be done by God!"¹

Did the bold sagacity of Hadrian foresee the heroic resolution with which Milan and her confederate Lombard cities would many years afterwards, and after some dire reverses and long oppression, resist the power of Barbarossa? Did he calculate with prophetic foresight the strength of Lombard republican freedom? Did he anticipate the field of Legnano, when the whole force of the Teutonic Empire was broken before the carroccio of Milan? Already was the secret treaty framed with Milan, Brescia, and Crema. These cities bound themselves not to make peace with the Emperor without the consent of the Pope and his Catholic successor. Hadrian was preparing for the last act of defiance, the open declaration of war, the excommunication of the Emperor, which he was pledged to pro-

¹ Hahn. *Monumenta*, i. p. 122. The date is March 19, 1159, from the Lateran palace. The date may be wrong, yet the bull authentic. Jaffé, I must observe, rejects it as spurious. This invective is reprinted in Pertz from a MS. formerly belonging to the Abbey of Malmedy. It appears there as an answer to a letter of Archbishop Hillin of Treves (published before in Honthelm, *Hist. Trev.* i. 581). Possibly I may have misplaced it. — Pertz, *Archiv.* iv. pp. 428–434. Boehmer seems to receive it as authentic, but as belonging to a period in which Frederick Barbarossa actually contemplated throwing off the Roman supremacy. — Preface to *Regesta*, p. vii

nounce after the signature of the treaty with the Republics, when his death put an end to this strange conflict, where each antagonist was allied with a republican party in the heart of his adversary's dominions. Sept. 1, 1159. Hadrian IV. died at Anagni: his remains were brought to Rome, and interred with the highest honors, and with the general respect if not the grief of the city, in the Church of St. Peter. Even the ambassadors of Frederick were present at the funeral. So ended the poor English scholar, at open war with perhaps the mightiest sovereign who had reigned in Transalpine Europe since Charlemagne.¹

¹ Radev. apud Muratori, Pars ii. p. 83. John of Salisbury reports another very curious conversation which he held with Hadrian IV. during a visit of three months at Benevento. John spoke strongly on the venality of Rome, and urged the popular saying, that Rome was not the mother but the stepmother of the churches; the sale of justice, purchase of preferments, and other abuses. "Ipse Romanus Pontifex omnibus gravis et pæne intolerabilis est?" The Pope smiled: "And what do you think?" John spoke handsomely of some of the Roman clergy as inaccessible to bribery, acknowledged the difficulty of the Pope in dealing with his Roman subjects, "dum frenos populi, et tu gravius opprimeris." The Pope concluded with the old proverb of the belly and members. — Polycraticus, vi. 24.

CHAPTER VIII.

ALEXANDER III. — VICTOR IV. — THOMAS À BECKET

THE whole conclave must have had the determined courage of Hadrian to concur in the election of a Pope: a schism was inevitable; a schism ^{Double election.} now the natural defence of the Empire against the Papacy, as a rebellion in Germany or Italy was that of the Papacy against the Empire. On one side were the zealous churchmen, who would hazard all for the supremacy of the spiritual power, those who thought the Sicilian alliance the safer and more legitimate policy of the See of Rome: and in Rome itself a faction of nobles, headed by the Frangipani, who maintained the papal authority in the city. On the other side were those who were attached to, or who dreaded the power of Barbarossa; the republican, or Arnoldine party in Rome; a few perhaps who loved peace, and thought it the best wisdom of the church to conciliate the Emperor. The conflicting accounts of the proceedings in the conclave were made public, on one side by the Pope, on the other by the Cardinals of the opposite faction,¹ and compel the inevitable conclusion that the passions of each party had effaced either all perception, or all respect for truth. Alexander III. is more minute and particular in his appeal to universal Christendom

¹ Both of these documents are in Radevicus.

on the justice of his election. On the third day of debate fourteen of the Cardinals agreed in the choice of himself Roland, the Cardinal of St. Mark, the chancellor of the Apostolic See, one of those legates who had shown so much audacity, and confronted so much peril at the Diet at Besançon. The cope was brought forth in which he was to be invested. Conscious of his insufficiency for this great post, he struggled against it with the usual modest reluctance.¹ Three only of the Cardinals, Octavian of St. Cecilia, John of St. Martin, and Guido of Crema, Cardinal of St. Callisto, were of the adverse faction, in close league with the imperial ambassadors, Otho Count Palatine,² and Guido Count of Blandrada. Octavian, prompted it is said by that ambassador, cried aloud he must not be compelled, and plucked the cope from his shoulders. The two others, the Cardinals Guido and of St. Martin, declared Octavian Pope; but a Roman senator who was present (the conclave then was an open court), indignant at his violence, seized the cope, and snatched it from the hand of Octavian. But Octavian's party were prepared for such an accident. His chaplain had another cope ready, in which he was invested with such indecent haste that, as it was declared, by a manifest divine judgment, the front part appeared behind, the hinder part before. Upon this

¹ Qui propter religionem suam cepit se excusare secundum quod canones præcipiunt. The author of this B. Museum Chronicle adds that the partisans of Octavian had ready *venustissimum* pallium, p. 46. See on this Chronicle book x. ch. 4.

² This must have been the Otho who threatened to cut down the insolent Cardinal Roland at Besançon; Guido of Blandrada, the Emperor's favorite, whom Hadrian had refused to elevate to the archiepiscopate of Ravenna. — *Epistola Canonica*. apud Radevic., Otho Morena, Raoul de Reb. Ges. Frederic, Tristan Calchi.

the assembly burst into derisive laughter. At that instant, the gates, which had been closed, were forcibly broken open, a hired soldiery rushed in with drawn swords, and surrounding Octavian carried him forth in state. Roland (Alexander III.) and the cardinals of his faction were glad to escape with their lives, but reached a stronghold fortified and garrisoned for their reception near St. Peter's,¹ and for nine days they lay concealed and in security from their enemies. Octavian, in the mean time, assumed the name of Victor IV.: he was acknowledged as lawful Pope by a great part of the senators and people. The Frangipani then rallied the adverse party; Alexander was rescued from his imprisonment or blockade.

On the other side, Victor, and the Cardinals of his faction, thus relate the proceedings of the election. The Cardinals, when they entered the conclave, solemnly pledged themselves to proceed with calm deliberation, to ascertain the opinion of each with grave impartiality, not to proceed to the election without the general assent of all. But in a secret synod held at Anagni, during the lifetime of Hadrian, the anti-imperialist Cardinals, who had urged the Pope to excommunicate Frederick, had taken an oath to elect one of their own party. This conspiracy was organized and maintained by the gold of William of Sicily. In direct infringement of the solemn compact, made before the commencement of the proceedings, they had suddenly by acclamation attempted to force the election of the Cardinal Roland. The division was of nine to fourteen; they acknowledge themselves to have been the minority in numbers, but of course a

¹ It was called the "munitio ecclesiæ Sancti Petri."

minority of the wisest and best. While thus the nine protested against the violation of the agreement that the election was to be by general assent, the fourteen proceeded to invest Roland of Sienna. The nine then, at the petition of the Roman people, by the election of the whole clergy, the assent of almost all the senators, and of all the captains, barons, and nobles, both within and without the city, invested Victor IV. with the insignia of the papedom.

Rome was no safe place for either Pope; each faction had its armed force, its wild and furious rabble. As Victor advanced to storm the stronghold near St. Peter's, occupied by his rival, he was hooted by the adverse mob: boys and women shouted and shrieked, called him by opprobrious names, "heretic, blasphemer!" sung opprobrious verses, taunted him with the name of Octavian, so infamous in the history of the Popes; a pasquinade was devised for the occasion in Latin verse.¹ On the eleventh day appeared Otho Frangipani and a party of the nobles, dispersed the forces of Victor, opened the gates of the stronghold, and led forth Alexander amid the acclamations of his partisans, but hurried him hastily away through the gates of the city.

¹ "Clamabant pueri contra ipsum ecclesiæ invasorem, dicentes, Maledicte, fili maledicti! dismanita, non eris Papa, non eris Papa! Alexandrum volumus, quem Deus elegit. Mulieres quoque blasphemantes ipsum hæreticum et eadem verba ingeminabant, et alia derisoria verba decantabant. Accedens autem Brito quidam audacter dixit hæc metricè:

Quid facis insane, patriæ mors, Octaviane
Cur præsumpsisti tunicam dividere Christi?
Jam jam pulvis eris, modo vivis, cras morieris."

—Vit. ii. apud Muratori: S. R. I. iii. i. p. 419. Compare the *Acta Vaticana* apud Baronium. Victor is there called *Smanta* compagnum — I presume from the plucking the stole from the shoulders of Alexander.

Neither indeed of the rival Popes could venture on his consecration in Rome. Alexander was Sept. 24. clad in the papal mantle at a place called the Cistern of Nero; ¹ consecrated by the Bishop of Ostia at Nimfa, towards the Apulian frontier; Victor by the Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum and the Bishops Oct. 4. of Nimfa and Ferentino, who had deserted the opposite party, in the monastery of Farsa.

The Emperor was besieging the city of Crema, when he received the intimation of this election Schism. from each of the rival Popes. He assumed the language of an impartial arbitrator: he summoned a council of all Christendom to meet at Pavia, and cited both the Popes to submit their claims to its decision. The summons to Alexander was addressed to the Cardinal Roland, the chancellor of the see of Rome.² Alexander refused to receive a mandate thus addressed, he protested against the right of the Emperor to summon a council without the permission of the Pope, nor would the Pope condescend to appear in the court of the Emperor to hear the sentence of an usurping tribunal. Victor, already sure of the favorable judgment,

¹ This was not lost on the Victorians; the Cistern of Nero was the place to which Nero had fled from the pursuing Romans; a fit place for people to hew themselves "cisterns which could not hold water." "*Undecimo (die) exierunt (a Româ) et pervenerunt ad Cisternam Neronis in qua latuit Nero fugiens Romanos insequentes. Juste Cisternam adierunt, quia deliquerunt fontem aque vivæ, et foderunt sibi cisternas, cisternas dissipatas, quæ continere non valent aquas. Et ibi die altero qui duodecimus erat ab electione domini Victoris induerunt cancellariam stolam et pallium erroris, in destructionem et confusionem ecclesiæ, ibique primum cantaverunt: Te Deum laudamus.*" — Epist. Canon. St. Petri, apud Radevie. ii. 31. Each party avers of the other that he was *execratus*, not *consecratus*.

² According to the somewhat doubtful authority of John of Salisbury Epist. 69), the Emperor's letter was addressed to Alexander as to Cardinal Roland, Chancellor of the Roman See, to Victor as Pontiff.

appeared with attestations of his lawful election from the Canons of St. Peter, and a great body of the clergy of Rome. The points which the party of Victor urged were, that Cardinal Roland had never been invested, according to his own admission, with the papal cope; the consent or rather the initiative of the whole clergy and people of Rome in the election of Octavian; the appearance of Roland after the election without the insignia of the Pope. The argument afterwards urged by the Emperor, was the disqualification of the Cardinals on account of their conspiracy, their premature election at Anagni during the lifetime of Hadrian. Neither Alexander, nor any one with authority to defend the cause of Alexander, appeared in the court. William of Pavia was silent.¹ The Council, after a grave debate and hearing of many witnesses (the Emperor had withdrawn to leave at least seeming freedom to the ecclesiastics), with one accord declared Victor Pope, condemned and excommunicated the contumacious Cardinal of Sienna. To Victor the

Feb. 10. Emperor paid the customary honors, held his
 Feb. 11. stirrup and kissed his feet.² Victor of course issued his excommunication of the Cardinal Roland. There was a secret cause behind, which no doubt strongly worked on the Emperor, through the Emperor on the council: letters of Alexander to the insurgent Lombard cities had been seized, and were in the hands of the Emperor.

¹ William of Pavia, Cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula, was afterwards accused by the wrathful Becket of betraying his master at Pavia. — Thom. Epist. ii. 21.

² Muratori is provoked by this schism from his usual calmness. “Rendè poscia Federigo a questo idolo tutti gli onori, con tenergli la staffa, e baciarli i *sfententi* piedi” — Sub ann.

The Archbishop of Cologne set out for France, the Bishop of Mantua to England, the Bishop of Prague to Hungary, to announce the decision of the Council to Christendom, and to demand or persuade allegiance to Pope Victor.

Alexander did not shrink from the contest. At Anagni he issued his excommunication against March 24. the Emperor Frederick, the Antipope, and all his adherents.¹ He despatched his legates to all the kingdoms of Europe. His title was sooner or later acknowledged by France, Spain, England, Constantinople, Sicily, and Jerusalem, by the Cistercian and Carthusian monks. He struck a formidable blow against Frederick, now deeply involved in his mortal strife with the Lombard republic. His legate, the Cardinal John, found his way into Milan, and there in the presence and with the sanction of the martial Archbishop Uberto (the Archbishop had commanded on more than one occasion the cavalry of Milan), he published the excommunication of Octavian the Antipope, and Frederick the Emperor. A few days after, the same ban was pronounced against the Bishops of Mantua and Lodi and the consuls of all the cities in league with the Emperor.²

Thus the two Popes divided the allegiance of Christendom. France, Spain, England asserted Alexander. A council at Toulouse, representing France and England, had rejected the decision of the council of Pavia.³ The Empire, Hungary, Bohemia, Norway, Sweden, submitted to Victor. Italy was divided: wherever the

¹ Radevic. ii. 22.

² Epist Eberhardo Archep. Saltzburg, April 1.

³ Pope Alexander, knowing his ground, condescended to appear by his representatives at this Council, though summoned by the kings of France and England.

authority of the Emperor prevailed, Victor was recognized as the successor of St. Peter; wherever it was opposed, Alexander. Sicily and Southern Italy were of Alexander's party. Each, Alexander at Anagni, Victor in Northern Italy, had uttered the last sentence of spiritual condemnation against his antagonist. From June 16-26. Anagni, knowing that Frederick dared not withdraw any strong force from the North of Italy, Alexander made a descent upon Rome, in order to add to the dignity of his cause by his possession of the capital city. He celebrated mass in the Lateran Church, and at Santa Maria Maggiore. But Rome, which would hardly endure the power of a Pope with undisputed authority, was no safe residence for one with a contested title. The turbulence of the people, the intrigues of the Antipope, the neighborhood of some of the Germans in the fortresses around (all the patrimony of St. Peter but Civita Vecchia, Anagni, and Terracina was in their power),¹ the uncertainty of support from Sicily, which was now threatened with civil war, the humiliation of Milan, induced him to seek refuge in France. Leaving a representative of his authority, Julius, the Cardinal of St. John, he embarked on board a Sicilian fleet: Villani, Archbishop of Imperialist Pisa, had met him at Terracina in his galley.² After some danger, touching at Leghorn, and Porto Venere, the Archbishop conveyed him to Piombino, and rendered him the highest honors: from thence he reached Genoa; and having remained there a short time, landed on the coast of France, near Montpellier.³

¹ Vit. Alexand. III.

² Marangoni, *Chronica Pisana*, p. 26.

³ He disembarked near Montpellier, April, 1162; reëmbarked at the same place, September, 1165.

He was received everywhere with demonstrations of the utmost respect. There were some threatening appearances, a suspicious agreement, into which Louis had been betrayed, or had weakly consented to, that he would meet the Emperor Frederick at Lannes in Burgundy, each with his Pope, to decide the great controversy, or with the design of raising a third Pope; and there was an agreement which, neither being in earnest, each eluded with no great respect for ^{Soon after} veracity.¹ Yet, notwithstanding all this, the ^{Christians,} 1161. rival kings of France and England seemed to forget their differences to pay him honor. He was met by both at Coureçy on the Loire; the two kings Feb. 9, 1162. walked on either side of his horse, holding his bridle, and so conducted him into the town. There April 8. for above three years he dwelt, maintaining the state, and performing all the functions of a Pope in every part of Europe which acknowledged his sway. During his absence Frederick and Frederick's Pope seemed at first to be establishing their power beyond all chance of resistance throughout Italy. Milan fell,² and suffered the terrible vengeance of the Emperor; March 26. her walls were razed, her citizens dispersed. Sicily

¹ The whole account of this affair, in which appears the consummate weakness of Louis of France, at his first interview the slave of Alexander, and the adroit pliancy mingled with firmness of Pope Alexander, is in the *Hist. Veziliensis* (apud Duchesne, and in Guizot's *Collection des Mémoires*, vol. vii.) compared with *Vit. Alexandri*, apud Muratori. See Reuter, *Geschicht. Alexander III.*, Berlin. The Protestant biographer is a thorough-going partisan of the subject of his biography — almost as much overawed as the convert Harter by Innocent III. — and almost as high a Hildebrandine. He seems to me to estimate the character of Alexander, even from that point of view, much too highly.

² In the plunder of Milan the relics of the three kings fell to the share of the Archbishop of Cologne: that city has ever since boasted of the holy spoil. — *Otto de Sanct. Blas. cxvi.*

was a prey to civil factions, and it might seem to depend on the leisure or the caprice of Frederick, how soon he would subjugate the rest of Italy to his iron and absolute tyranny. But dark reverses were to come.

Death of
Victor IV.
April 20.
1164.

Two years after the departure of Alexander to France, the Antipope Victor died at Lucca.

Paschal III.
April 22.

Guido of Crema was chosen, it was said by one Cardinal only, but by a large body of Lombard clergy, and took the name of Paschal III.

At this period the whole mind of Christendom was drawn away and absorbed by a contest in a remoter province of the Christian world, which for a time obscured, at least among the more religious, and all who were enthralled to the popular and dominant religion (in truth, the larger part of Europe), both the wars of monarchy and republicanism in Northern Italy, and the strife of Pope and Antipope. Neither Alexander III. nor Paschal III. in their own day occupied to such an extent the thoughts of the clergy and the laity throughout Christendom: the church has scarcely a saint so speedily canonized after his death, so widely or so fervently worshipped, as Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. Nor was it only the personal character of the antagonists, or the circumstances of the strife, it was the great principle involved, comprehending as it did the whole authority and sanctity of the sacerdotal order, which gave this commanding interest to the new war between the spiritual and temporal powers. It was in England that this war was waged; on its event depended to a great degree the maintenance of the hierarchy, as a separate and privileged caste of mankind, subject to

Thomas a
Becket.

its own jurisdiction, and irresponsible but to its own superiors.

Our history, therefore, enters at length into this contest, not from pardonable nationality over-estimating its importance, but in the conviction that it is a chapter in the annals of Christianity indispensable to its completeness, general in its interest, and beyond almost all others characteristic of its age. Nor is it insulated from the common affairs of Latin Christendom. Throughout, the history of Becket is in the closest connection with that of Pope Alexander, and that of the Emperor Frederick and his Antipope. If not the fate of Becket, his support by Alexander III. depends on the variable fortunes of the Pope. While Alexander is in France (in which Henry of England had a wider dominion than the King of France), Becket is somewhat coldly urged to prudence and moderation. Still more when Alexander is returned to Italy. Then Becket's cause rises and falls with the Pope's prosperous or adverse fortunes : it depends on the predominance or the weakness of the Imperial power. The gold of England is the strength of Alexander. When Frederick is in the ascendant, and Henry threatens to withhold those supplies which maintain the Papal armies in the South, or the Papal interests in Milan and the Lombard cities ; or when Henry threatens to fall off to the Antipope ; Becket is wellnigh abandoned. Becket himself cannot disguise his indignation at the tergiversation of the Pope, the venality of the College of Cardinals. No sooner is Frederick's power on the wane ; no sooner has he suffered some of those fatal disasters which smote his authority, than Becket raises the song of

triumph. He knows that Pope Alexander will now dare to support him to the utmost.

The Norman conquest of England was as total a revolution in the Church of the island as in the civil government and social condition. The Anglo-Saxon clergy, since the days of Dunstan, had produced no remarkable man. The triumph of monasticism had enfeebled without sanctifying the secular clergy; it had spread over the island all its superstition, its thralldom of the mind, its reckless prodigality of lands and riches to pious uses, without its vigor, its learning, its industrial civilization. Like its faithful disciple, its humble acolyte, its munificent patron, Edward the Confessor, it might conceal much gentle and amiable goodness; but its outward character was that of timid and unworldly ignorance, unfit to rule, and exercising but feeble and unbeneficial influence over a population become at once more rude and fierce, and more oppressed and servile, by the Danish conquest. Its ignorance may have been exaggerated. Though it may have been true that hardly a priest from Trent to Thames understood Latin, that the services of the church, performed by men utterly unacquainted with the ecclesiastical language, must have lost all solemnity; yet the Anglo-Saxons possessed a large store of vernacular Christian literature — poems, homilies, legends. They had begun to form an independent Teutonic Christianity. Equally wonderful was the multitude of their kings who had taken the cowl, or on their thrones lived a monastic life and remained masters of wealth only to bestow it on the poor and on monasteries. The multitude of saints (no town was without its saint)

was so numerous as to surpass all power of memory to retain them, and wanted writers to record them.¹

The Normans were not only the foremost nation in arms, in personal strength, valor, enterprise, perseverance, and all the greater qualities of a military aristocracy: by a singular accident, it might be called, they possessed a seminary of the most learned and able churchmen. The martial, ambitious, unlearned Odo of Bayeux was no doubt the type of many of the Norman prelates; of some of those on whom the Conqueror, when he built up his great system of ecclesiastical feudalism in the conquered land, bestowed some of the great sees in England, of which he had dispossessed the defeated Saxons. But from the same monastery of Bec came in succession two Primates of the Norman Church in England, in learning, sanctity, and general ability not inferior to any bishops of their time in Christendom — Lanfranc and Anselm. Lanfranc, to whom the Church had looked up as the most powerful antagonist of Berengar; Anselm as the profound metaphysician, who was to retain as willing prisoners, within the pale of orthodoxy, those strong speculative minds which before, and afterwards during the days of Abélard, should venture into those dangerous regions.

The Abbey of Bec, as has been said, had been

¹ "De regibus dico qui pro amplitudine potestatis licenter indulgere voluptatibus possent; quorum quidam in patriâ, quidam Romæ, mutato habitu, cœleste lucrati sunt regnum, beatum nacti commercium: multi specie tenus, totâ vitâ mundum amplexi; ut thesauros egenis effunderent, monasteriis dividerent. Quid dicam de tot episcopis, heremitis, abbatibus. Nonne tota insula tantis reliquiis indigenarum fulgurat ut vix vicum aliquem prætereas, ubi novî sancti nomen non audias! quam multorum etiam perit memoria, pro scriptorum inopiâ." — Will. Malmes. p. 417, edit. Hist. Soc.

Abbey of
Bec. founded by a rude Norman knight, Herluin, in one of those strange accesses of devotion which suddenly changed men of the most uncongenial minds and most adverse habits into models of the most austere and almost furious piety. Herluin was as ignorant as he was rude ; his followers, who soon gathered around him, scarcely less so. But the Monastery of Bec, before half a century had elapsed, was a seat of learning. Strangers who were wandering over Europe found that which was too often wanting in the richer and settled convents, seclusion and austerity. Such was the case with Lanfranc : in the Abbey of Bec there was rigor enough to satisfy the most intense craving after self-torture. But the courtly Italian scholar was not lost in the Norman monk. Lanfranc became at once a model of the severest austerity and the accomplished theologian, to whom Latin Christendom looked up as the champion of her vital doctrine. Lanfranc became Abbot of St. Stephen's at Caen.

The Norman conqueror found that, although he had subjugated the Anglo-Saxon thanes and Anglo-Saxon people, he had not subjugated the Anglo-Saxon clergy. Notwithstanding the Papal benediction of the conquest of England, the manner in which Alexander II. openly espoused the cause, and the greater Hildebrand treated the kindred mind of the Conqueror with respect shown to no other monarch in Christendom, there was long a stubborn inert resistance, which with so superstitious a people might anywhere burst out into insurrection. As he had seized and confiscated the estates of the thanes, so the Conqueror put into safer, into worthier hands, the great benefices of the Church. Lanfranc (there could be no wiser measure than to advance a

man so famous for piety and learning throughout Christendom) was summoned to assume the primacy, from which the Conqueror, of his own will, though not without Papal sanction, had degraded the Anglo-Saxon Stigand. Lanfranc resisted, not only from monastic aversion to state and secular pursuits, but from unwillingness to rule a barbarous people, of whose language he was ignorant. Lanfranc yielded: he came as a Norman; his first act was to impose penance on the Anglo-Saxon soldiers who had dared to oppose William at Hastings; even on the archers whose bolts had flown at random, and did slay or might have slain Norman knights.

The Primate consummated the work of William in ejecting the Anglo-Saxon bishops and clergy. William would even proscribe their Saints: names unknown, barbarous, which refused to harmonize with Latin, were ignominiously struck out of the calendar as unauthorized and intrusive. The Primate proceeded to the degradation of the holy Wulstan of Worcester. His crime was want of learning, ignorance of French, perhaps rather of Latin. Wulstan, the pride, the holy example of the Anglo-Saxon episcopate, appeared before the Synod: "From the first I knew my unworthiness. I was compelled to be a bishop: the clergy, the prelates, my master, by the authority of the Apostolic See, laid this burden on my shoulder." He advanced to the tomb of the Confessor; he laid down his crosier on the stone: "Master, to thee only I yield up my staff." He took his seat among the monks. The crosier remained imbedded in the stone; and this wonder, which might seem as if the Confessor approved the resignation, was interpreted the other way. Wul-

stan alone retained his see. The Anglo-Saxon secular clergy, notwithstanding the triumph of monasticism, the severe laws of Edgar, even of Canute, still clung to their right or usage of marriage. Lanfranc could disguise even to himself, as zeal against the married priests, his persecution of the Anglo-Saxon clergy.

A king so imperious as William, and a churchman so firm as Lanfranc, could hardly avoid collision. Though they scrupled not to despoil the Saxon prelates, the Church must suffer no spoliation. The estates of the See of Canterbury must pass whole and inviolable.

The uterine brother of the King (his mother's son by a second marriage), Odo the magnificent and able Bishop of Bayeux, his counsellor in peace, ever by his side in war, though he neither wore arms nor engaged in battle, had seized, as Count of Kent, twenty-five manors belonging to the Archiepiscopal See.¹ The Primate summoned the Bishop of Bayeux to public judgment on Penenden Heath; the award was in the Archbishop's favor. Still William honored Lanfranc: Lanfranc, in the King's absence in Normandy, was chief justiciary, vicegerent within the realm. Lanfranc respected William. When the Conqueror haughtily rejected the demand of Hildebrand himself for allegiance and subsidy, we hear no remonstrance from the Primate. The Primate refused to go to Rome at the summons of the Pope. William Rufus, while Lanfranc lived, in some degree restrained his covetous encroachments on the wealth of the Church. Lanfranc

¹ Odo of Bayeux, according to Malmesbury, had even higher aspirations; his wealth, like Wolsey's, was designed to buy the Papacy itself. "In aggerendis thesauris mirus, tergiversari miræ astutiæ; pene Papatum Romanum absens a civibus mercatus fuerit: peras peregrinorum epistolis et nummis infarciens." — p. 457.

had the prudence not to provoke the ungovernable King. But for five years after the death of Lanfranc Rufus would have no Primate, whose importunate control he thus escaped, while at the same time he converted to his own uses, without remonstrance, or at least without resistance, the splendid revenue of the see. Nothing but the wrath of God, as he supposed, during an illness which threatened his life, compelled him to place the crosier in the hands of the meek and, as he hoped, unworldly Anselm. It required as much violence in the whole nation, to whom Anselm's fame and virtues were so well known, to compel Anselm to accept the primacy, as to induce the King to bestow it.

Anselm,
Archbishop
of Canter-
bury.
A.D. 1093.

But when Primate, Anselm, the monk, the philosopher, was as high, as impracticable a churchman as the boldest or the haughtiest. Anselm's was passive courage, Anselm's was gentle endurance; but as unyielding, as impregnable, as that of Lanfranc, even of Hildebrand himself. No one concession could be wrung from him of property, of right, or of immunity belonging to his Church. He was a man whom no humiliation could humble: privation, even pain, he bore not only with the patience but with the joy of a monk. He was exiled: he returned the same meek, unoffending, unimpassioned man. His chief or first quarrel with Rufus was as to which of the Popes England should acknowledge. The Norman Anselm had before his advancement acknowledged Urban. It ended in Urban being the Pope of England. Nor was it with the violent, rapacious Rufus alone that Anselm stood in this quiet, unconquerable oppugnancy; the more prudent and politic Henry I. is committed in the same

strife. It was now the question of Investitures. At Rome, during his first exile, Anselm was deeply impregnated with the Italian notions of Investiture, that "venomous source of all simony." But the Norman kings were as determined to assert their feudal supremacy as the Franconian or Hohenstaufen Emperors.

Anselm is again in Rome: the Pope Urban threatens to excommunicate the King of England; Anselm interferes; the King is not actually excommunicate, but the ban is on all his faithful counsellors. At length, after almost a life, at least almost an archiepiscopate, passed in this strife with the King, to whom in all other respects except as regards the property of the see and the rights of the Church, Anselm is the most loyal of subjects, the great dispute about Investitures comes to an end. The wise Henry I. has discovered that, by surrendering a barren ceremony, he may retain the substantial power. He consents to abandon the form of granting the ring and pastoral staff; he retains the homage, and that which was the real object of the strife, the power of appointing to the wealthy sees and abbacies of the realm. The Church has the honor of the triumph; has wrung away the seeming concession; and Anselm, who in his unworldly views had hardly perhaps comprehended the real point at issue, has the glory and the conscious pride of success.

But the splendid and opulent benefices of the Anglo-Norman Church were too rich prizes to be bestowed on accomplished scholars, profound theologians, holy monks: the bishops at the close of Henry's reign are barons rather than prelates, their palaces are castles, their retainers vassals in arms. The wars between Stephen and the Empress Matilda

Character
of the
Anglo-
Norman
hierarchy.

are episcopal at least as much as baronial wars. It is the brother of Stephen, Henry Bishop of Winchester, the legate of the Pope, who is the author of Stephen's advancement. The citizens of London proclaim him: the coronation is at Winchester. The feeble Archbishop Theobald, the one less worldly prelate, yields to the more commanding mind of the royal bishop. In the Council of Oxford it was openly declared that the right to elect the king was in the bishops.¹ The Bishop of Salisbury had two nephews, the Bishops of Lincoln and of Ely; one of his sons (his sons by his concubine, Maud of Ramsbury) was Chancellor,² one Treasurer. Until the allegiance of the Bishops to Stephen wavered, the title of Matilda was hardly dangerous to the King. Stephen arrested the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln at Oxford, compelled them to surrender their strong castles of Newark, Salisbury, Sherborne, and Malmesbury. The Bishop of Ely flew to arms, threw himself into Devizes; it was only the threat to hang up his nephew, which compelled him to capitulate.³ It was a strange confusion. The whole of the bishops' castles, treasures, munitions of war, were seized into the King's hands; he held them in the most rigid and inexorable grasp;⁴ yet at the same time Stephen did public penance for having dared to lay his impious hands on the "Christs of the Lord." The revolt of the Bishop of Ely was only the signal for the general war: Stephen was taken in the battle of Lincoln, his defeated army was under the walls of that city to chastise the Bishop.

¹ "Eorum majori parti cleri Angliæ, ad ejus jus potissimum spectat principem eligere, simulque ordinare." — p. 746.

² "Qui nepos esse et plusquam nepos ferebatur."

³ *Gesta Stephani*, p. 50.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 51.

If Matilda's pride had not alienated Henry of Winchester, as her exactions did the citizens of London, she might have obtained at once full possession of the throne. It was in besieging the castle of the Bishop of Winchester in that city that Robert of Gloucester, the leader of her party, was attacked by the Londoners under the Bishop of Winchester in person, and was taken in his retreat to Bristol. The Archbishop Theobald, who had now espoused Matilda's cause, hardly escaped.

Such were the prelates of England just before the commencement of Henry II.'s reign: all, says a contemporary writer, or almost all, wearing arms, mingling in war, indulging in all the cruelties and exactions of war.¹ The lower clergy could hardly, with such examples, be otherwise than, too many of them, lawless and violent men. Yet the Church demanded for the property and persons of such prelates and such clergy an absolute, inviolable sanctity. The seizure of their palaces, though fortified and garrisoned, was an invasion of the property of the Church. The seizure, maltreatment, imprisonment, far more any sentence of the law in the King's Courts upon their persons was impiety, sacrilege.²

Such had been, not many years before, the state of the clergy in England, when broke out in England,

¹ "Ipsi nihilominus, ipsi episcopi, quod pudet quidem dicere, non tamen omnes, sed plurimi ex omnibus, ferro accincti, armis instructi, cum patriæ perversoribus superbissimis invecti equis, prædæ participes in milites bellicâ sorte interceptos vel pecuniosos quibuscunque occurrunt vinculis et cruciatibus exponere," &c. — *Gesta Steph.* p. 99.

² "Si episcopi tramitem justitiæ in aliquo transgrederentur non esse regis sed canonum judicium: sine publico et ecclesiastico concilio illos nulla possessione privari posse." — *Malmesb.* p. 719. The grant of these castles, when surrendered to laymen, was an invasion on Church property.

and was waged for so many years, the great strife for the maintenance of the sacerdotal order as a peculiar caste of mankind, for its sole jurisdiction and its irresponsibility. Every individual in that caste, to its lowest door-keeper, claimed an absolute immunity from capital punishment. The executioner in those ages sacrificed hundreds of common human lives to the terror of the law. The churchman alone, to the most menial of the clerical body, stood above such law. The churchman too was judge without appeal in all causes of privilege or of property, which he possessed or in which he claimed the right of possession.

This strife was to be carried on with all the animation and interest of a single combat, instead of the long and confused conflict of order against order. Nor was it complicated with any of those intricate relations of the imperial and the papal power (the Emperor claiming to be the representative of the Caesars of Rome, the Popes not only to be successors of the chief of the apostles, but also temporal sovereigns of Rome), which had drawn out to such interminable length the contest between the pontiffs and the houses of Franconia and Hohenstaufen. The champion of the civil power was Henry II. of England, a sovereign, at his Henry II. accession, with the most extensive territories and least limited power, with vast command of wealth, above any monarch of his time ; a man of great ability, decision, and activity ; of ungovernable passions and intense pride, which did not prevent him from stooping to dissimulation, intrigue and subtle policy. On the other hand, the Churchman, a subject of that Becket. sovereign, not of noble birth, but advanced by the grace of the king to the highest secular power ; yet

when raised by his own transcendent capacity and by the same misjudging favor to the height of ecclesiastical dignity, sternly and at once rending asunder all ties of attachment and gratitude, sacrificing the unbounded power and influence which he might have retained if he had still condescended to be the favorite of the king; an exile, yet so formidable as to be received not as a fugitive, but at once as a most valuable ally and an object of profound reverence by the King of France, and by other foreign princes. For seven years Becket inflexibly maintains his ground against the king, and almost all the more powerful prelates of England, and some of Normandy. At times seemingly abandoned by the Pope himself, yet disdaining to yield, and rebuking even the Pope for his dastardly and temporizing policy, he at length extorts his restoration to his see from the reluctant monarch. His barbarous assassination gave a temporary, perhaps, but complete triumph to his cause. The king, though not actually implicated in the murder, cannot avert the universal indignation but by the most humiliating submission, absolute prostration before the sacerdotal power, and by public and ignominious penance. Becket was the martyr for the Church, and this not only in the first paroxysm of devotion, and not only with the clergy, whom the murder of a holy prelate threw entirely on his side, but with the whole people, to whom his boundless charities, his splendor, his sufferings, his exile, and the imposing austerity of his life, had rendered him an object of awe and of love. He was the Saint whom the Church hastened to canonize, was compared in language, to us awfully profane, in his own time that of natural veneration, to the Saviour himself. The wor-

ship of Becket — and in those days it would be difficult to discriminate between popular worship and absolute adoration — superseded, not in Canterbury alone, nor in England alone, that of the Son of God, and even of his Virgin Mother.

Popular poetry, after the sanctification of Becket, delighted in throwing the rich colors of mar-^{Legend.}vel over his birth and parentage. It invented, or rather interwove with the pedigree of the martyr, one of those romantic traditions which grew out of the wild adventures of the crusades, and which occur in various forms in the ballads of all nations. That so great a saint should be the son of a gallant champion of the cross, and of a Saracen princess, was a fiction too attractive not to win general acceptance.¹ The father of Becket, so runs the legend, a gallant soldier, was a captive in the Holy Land, and inspired the daughter of his master with an ardent attachment. Through her means he made his escape; but the enamored princess could not endure life without him. She too fled and made her way to Europe. She had learned but two words of the Christian language, London and Gilbert. With these two magic sounds upon her lips she reached London; and as she wandered through the streets, constantly repeating the name of Gilbert, she was met by Becket's faithful servant. Becket, as a good Christian, seems to have entertained religious scruples as to the propriety of wedding the

¹ The early life of Becket has been mystified both by the imaginative tendencies of the age immediately following his own, and by the theorizing tendencies of modern history. I shall shock some readers by unscrupulously rejecting the tale of the Saracen princess; if ever there was an historic ballad, an unquestionable ballad; as well as the Saxon descent of Becket, as undeniably an historic fable.

faithful, but misbelieving, or, it might be, not sincerely believing maiden. The case was submitted to the highest authority, and argued before the Bishop of London. The issue was the baptism of the princess, by the name of Matilda (that of the empress queen), and their marriage in St. Paul's with the utmost publicity and splendor.

But of this wondrous tale, not one word had reached the ears of any of the seven or eight contemporary biographers of Becket, most of them his most intimate friends or his most faithful attendants.¹ It was neither known to John of Salisbury, his confidential adviser and correspondent, nor to Fitz-Stephen, an officer of his court in chancery, and dean of his chapel when archbishop, who was with him at Northampton, and at his death; nor to Herbert de Bosham, likewise one of his officers when chancellor, and his faithful attendant throughout his exile; nor to the monk of Pontigny,

¹ There are no less than seven full contemporary, or nearly contemporary, Lives of Becket, besides fragments, legends, and "Passions." Dr. Giles has reprinted, and in some respects enlarged, those works from the authority of MSS. I give them in the order of his volumes. I. *Vita Sancti Thomæ. Auctore Edward Grim.* II. *Auctore Roger de Pontiniaco.* III. *Auctore Willelmo Filio Stephani.* IV. *Auctoribus Joanne Decano Salisburiensi, et Alano Abbate Teuksburiensi.* V. *Auctore Willelmo Canturburiensi.* VI. *Auctore Anonymo Lambethiensi.* VII. *Auctore Herberto de Bosham.* Of these, Grim, Fitz-Stephen, and Herbert de Bosham were throughout his life in more or less close attendance on Becket. The learned John of Salisbury was his bosom friend and counsellor. Roger of Pontigny was his intimate associate and friend in that monastery. William was probably prior of Canterbury at the time of Becket's death. The sixth professes also to have been witness to the death of Becket. (He is called Lambethiensis by Dr. Giles, merely because the MS. is in the Lambeth Library.) Add to these the curious French poem, written five years after the murder of Becket, by Garnier of Pont S. Maxence, partly published in the Berlin Transactions, by the learned Immanuel Bekker. All these, it must be remembered, write of the man; the later monkish writers (though near the time, Hoveden, Gervase, Diceto, Brompton) of the Saint.

who waited upon him and enjoyed his most intimate confidence during his retreat in that convent; nor to Edward Grim, his standard-bearer, who, on his way from Clarendon, reproached him with his weakness, and having been constantly attached to his person, finally interposed his arm between his master and the first blow of the assassin. Nor were these ardent admirers of Becket silent from any severe aversion to the marvellous; they relate, with unsuspecting faith, dreams and prognostics which revealed to the mother the future greatness of her son, even his elevation to the see of Canterbury.¹

To the Saxon descent of Becket, a theory in which, on the authority of an eloquent French writer,² modern history has seemed disposed to acquiesce, these biographers not merely give no support, but furnish direct contradiction. The lower people no doubt admired during his life, and worshipped after death, the blessed Thomas of Canterbury, and the people were mostly Saxon. But it was not as a Saxon, but as a Saint, that Becket was the object of unbounded popularity during his life, of idolatry after his death.

The father of Becket, according to the distinct words of one contemporary biographer, was a native of Rouen, his mother of Caen.³ Gilbert was Parentage and education.

¹ Brompton is not the earliest writer who recorded this tale; he took it from the *Quadrilogus* I., but of this the date is quite uncertain. The exact date of Brompton is unknown. See preface in Twysden. He goes down to the end of Richard II.

² *Mons. Thierry, Hist. des Normands.* Lord Lyttelton (*Life of Henry II.*) had before asserted the Saxon descent of Becket: perhaps he misled M. Thierry.

³ The anonymous *Lambethensis*, after stating that many Norman merchants were allured to London by the greater mercantile prosperity, proceeds: "*Ex horum numero fuit Gilbertus quidam cognomento Becket, patriâ Rotomagensis . . . habuit autem uxorem, nomine Roseam natione*

no knight-errant, but a sober merchant, tempted by commercial advantages to settle in London: his mother neither boasted of royal Saracenic blood, nor bore the royal name of Matilda; she was the daughter of an honest burgher of Caen. His Norman descent is still further confirmed by his claim of relationship, or connection at least, as of common Norman descent, with Archbishop Theobald.¹ The parents of Becket, he asserts himself, were merchants of unimpeached character, not of the lowest class. Gilbert Becket is said to have served the honorable office of sheriff, but his

Born
A.D. 1118.

fortune was injured by fires and other casualties.² The young Becket received his earliest education among the monks of Merton in Surrey, towards whom he cherished a fond attachment, and delighted to visit them in the days of his splendor. The dwelling of a respectable London merchant seems to have been a place where strangers of very different pursuits, who resorted to the metropolis of England, took up their lodging: and to Gilbert Becket's house came persons both disposed and qualified to cultivate in various ways the extraordinary talents displayed by the youth, who was singularly handsome, and of engaging manners.³ A knight, whose name, Richard de Aquila, occurs with distinction in the annals of the time, one of his father's guests, delighted in initiating the gay and spirited boy in chivalrous exercises, and in the chase with hawk and hound. On a hawking adventure

Cadomensem, genere burgensium quoque non disparem." — Apud Giles, ii. p. 73.

¹ See below.

² "Quod si ad generis mei radicem et progenitores meos intenderis, cives quidem fuerunt Londonienses, in medio concivium suorum habitantes sine querelâ, nec omnino infimi." — Epist. 130.

³ Grim, p. 9. Pontiniac, p. 96.

the young Becket narrowly escaped being drowned in the Thames. At the same time, or soon after, he was inured to business by acting as clerk to a wealthy relative, Osborn Octuomini, and in the office of the Sheriff of London.¹ His accomplishments were completed by a short residence in Paris, the best school for the language spoken by the Norman nobility. To his father's house came likewise two learned civilians from Bologna, no doubt on some mission to the Archbishop of Canterbury. They were so captivated by young Becket, that they strongly recommended him to Archbishop Theobald, whom the father of Becket reminded of their common honorable descent from a knightly family near the town of Thiersy.² Becket was at once on the high road of advancement. His extraordinary abilities were cultivated by In the household of the Archbishop. the wise patronage, and employed in the service of the primate. Once he accompanied that prelate to Rome;³ and on more than one other occasion visited that great centre of Christian affairs. He was permitted to reside for a certain time at each of the great schools for the study of the canon law, Bologna and Auxerre.⁴ He was not, however, without enemies. Even in the court of Theobald began the jealous rivalry with Roger, afterwards Archbishop of York, then Archdeacon of Canterbury.⁵ Twice the superior in-

¹ Grim, p. 8.

² "Eo familiaris, quod præfatus Gilbertus cum domino archipræsule de propinquitatē et genere loquebatur: ut ille *ortu Normannus* et circa Thierici villam de equestri ordine natus vicinus." — Fitz-Stephen, 184. Thiersy or Thierchville.

³ Roger de Pontigny, p. 100.

⁴ Fitz-Stephen, p. 185.

⁵ According to Fitz-Stephen, Thomas was less learned (*minus literatus*) than his rival, but of loftier character and morals. — P. 184.

fluence of the archdeacon obtained his dismissal from the service of Theobald; twice he was reinstated by the good offices of Walter, Bishop of Rochester. At length the elevation of Roger to the see of York left the field open to Becket. He was appointed to the vacant archdeaconry, the richest benefice, after the bishoprics, in England. From that time he ruled without rival in the favor of the aged Theobald. Preferments were heaped upon him by the lavish bounty of his patron.¹ During his exile he was reproached with his ingratitude to the king, who had raised him from poverty. "Poverty!" he rejoined; "even then I held the archdeaconry of Canterbury, the provostship of Beverley, a great many churches, and several prebends."² The trial and the triumph of Becket's precocious abilities was a negotiation of the utmost difficulty with the court of Rome. The first object was to obtain the legatine power for Archbishop Theobald; the second tended, more than almost all measures, to secure the throne of England to the house of Plantagenet. Archbishop Theobald, with his clergy, had inclined to the cause of Matilda and her son; they had refused to officiate at the coronation of Eustace, son of King Stephen. Becket not merely obtained from Eugenius III. the full papal approbation of this refusal, but a condemnation of Stephen (whose title had before been sanctioned by Eugenius himself) as a perjured usurper.³

¹ "Plurimæ ecclesiæ, præbendæ nonnullæ." Among the livings were one in Kent, and St. Mary le Strand; among the prebends, two at London and Lincoln. The archdeaconry of Canterbury was worth 100 pounds of silver a-year.

² Epist. 130.

³ Lord Lyttelton gives a full account of this transaction. — Book i. p. 213.

But on the accession of Henry II., the aged Archbishop began to tremble at his own work ; serious apprehensions arose as to the disposition of the young king towards the Church. His connection was but remote with the imperial family (though his mother had worn the imperial crown, and some imperial blood might flow in his veins) ; but the Empire was still the implacable adversary of the papal power. Even from his father he might have received an hereditary taint of hatred to the Church, for the Count of Anjou had on many occasions shown the utmost hostility to the Hierarchy, and had not scrupled to treat churchmen of the highest rank with unexampled cruelty. In proportion as it was important to retain a young sovereign of such vast dominions in allegiance to the Church, so was it alarming to look forward to his disobedience. The Archbishop was anxious to place near his person some one who might counteract this suspected perversity, and to prevent his young mind from being alienated from the clergy by fierce and lawless counsellors. He had discerned not merely unrivalled abilities, but with prophetic sagacity, his Archdeacon's lofty and devoted churchmanship. Through the recommendation of the primate, Becket was raised to the dignity of chancellor,¹ an office which made him

¹ This remarkable fact in Becket's history rests on the authority of his friend, John of Salisbury: "Erat enim in suspectu adolescentia regis et juvenum et pravorum hominum, quorum conciliis agi videbatur . . . insipientiam et malitiam formidabat . . . cancellarium procurabat in curiâ ordinari, cujus ope et operâ novi regis ne sciret in ecclesiam, impetum cohiberet et consilii sui temperaret malitiam." — Apud Giles, p. 321. This is repeated in almost the same words by William of Canterbury, vol. ii. p. 2. Compare what may be read almost as the dying admonitions of Theobald to the king: "Suggerunt vobis filii sæculi hujus, ut ecclesiæ minuatis auctoritatem, ut vobis regni dignitas augeatur." He had before said, "Cui

the second civil power in the realm, inasmuch as his seal was necessary to countersign all royal mandates. Nor was it without great ecclesiastical influence, as in the chancellor was the appointment of all the royal chaplains, and the custody of vacant bishoprics, abba-cies, and benefices.¹

But the Chancellor, who was yet, with all his great
BecketChancellor. preferments, only in deacon's orders, might seem disdainfully to throw aside the habits, feelings, restraints of the churchman, and to aspire as to the plenitude of secular power, so to unprecedented secular magnificence.² Becket shone out in all the graces of an accomplished courtier, in the bearing and valor of a gallant knight; though at the same time he displayed the most consummate abilities for business, the promptitude, diligence, and prudence of a practised statesman. The beauty of his person, the affability of his manners, the extraordinary acuteness of his senses,³ his activity in all chivalrous exercises, made him the chosen companion of the king in his constant diversions, in the chase and in the mimic war, in all but his debaucheries. The king would willingly have lured the Chancellor into this companionship likewise; but the silence of his bitterest enemies, in confirmation of his own solemn protestations, may be admitted as conclusive testimonies to his unimpeached morals.⁴ The

deest gratia Ecclesiæ, tota creatrix Trinitas adversatur." — Apud Bouquet, xvi. p. 504. Also Roger de Pontigny, p. 101.

¹ Fitz-Stephen, p. 186. Compare on the office of chancellor Lord Campbell's Life of Becket.

² De Bosham, p. 17.

³ See a curious passage on the singular sensitiveness of his hearing, and even of his smell. — Roger de Pontigny, p. 96.

⁴ Roger de Pontigny, p. 104. His character by John of Salisbury is remarkable: "Erat supra modum captator auræ popularis . . . etsi superbus

power of Becket throughout the king's dominions equalled that of the king himself—he was king in all but name: the world, it was said, had never seen two friends so entirely of one mind.¹ The well-known anecdote best illustrates their intimate familiarity. As they rode through the streets of London on a bleak winter day they met a beggar in rags. “Would it not be charity,” said the king, “to give that fellow a cloak, and cover him from the cold?” Becket assented; on which the king plucked the rich furred mantle from the shoulders of the struggling Chancellor and threw it, to the amazement and admiration of the bystanders, no doubt to the secret envy of the courtiers at this proof of Becket's favor, to the shivering beggar.²

But it was in the graver affairs of the realm that Henry derived still greater advantage from the wisdom and the conduct of the Chancellor.³ To Becket's counsels his admiring biographers attribute the pacification of the kingdom, the expulsion of the foreign mercenaries who during the civil wars of Stephen's reign had devastated the land and had settled down as conquerors, especially in Kent, the humiliation of the refractory barons and the demolition of their castles. The peace was so profound that merchants could travel everywhere in safety, and even the Jews collect their

esset et vanus et interdum faciem prætendebat insipienter amantium et verba proferret, admirandus tamen et imitandus erat in corporis castitate.”—P. 320. See an adventure related by William of Canterbury, p. 3.

¹ Grim, p. 12. Roger de Pontigny, p. 102. Fitz-Stephen, p. 192.

² Fitz-Stephen, p. 191. Fitz-Stephen is most full and particular on the chancellorship of Becket.

³ It is not quite clear how soon after the accession of Henry the appointment of the chancellor took place. I should incline to the earlier date, A.D. 1155.

debts.¹ The magnificence of Becket redounded to the glory of his sovereign. In his ordinary life he was sumptuous beyond precedent; he kept an open table, where those who were not so fortunate as to secure a seat at the board had clean rushes strewn on the floor, on which they might repose, eat, and carouse at the Chancellor's expense. His household was on a scale vast even for that age of unbounded retainership, and the haughtiest Norman nobles were proud to see their sons brought up in the family of the merchant's son. In his embassy to Paris to demand the hand of the Princess Margaret for the king's infant son, described with such minute accuracy by Fitz-Stephen,² he outshone himself, yet might seem to have a loyal rather than a personal aim in this unrivalled pomp. The French crowded from all quarters to see the splendid procession pass, and exclaimed, "What must be the king, whose Chancellor can indulge in such enormous expenditure?"

Even in war the Chancellor had displayed not only the abilities of a general, but a personal prowess, which, though it found many precedents in those times, might appear somewhat incongruous in an ecclesiastic, who yet held all his clerical benefices. In the expedition made by King Henry to assert his right to the dominions of the Counts of Toulouse, Becket appeared at the head of seven hundred knights who did him service, and foremost in every adventurous exploit was the valiant Chancellor. Becket's bold counsel urged the immediate storming of the city, which would have been followed by the captivity of

Ambassador
to Paris.
A.D. 1160.

War in
Toulouse.

¹ Fitz-Stephen, p. 187.

² P. 196.

the King of France. Henry, in whose character impetuosity was strangely moulded up with irresolution, dared not risk this violation of feudal allegiance, the captivity of his suzerain. The event of the war showed the policy as well as the superior military judgment of the warlike Chancellor. At a period somewhat later, Becket, who was left to reduce certain castles which held out against his master, unhorsed in single combat and took prisoner a knight of great distinction, Engelran de Trie. He returned to Henry in Normandy at the head of 1200 knights and 4000 stipendiary horsemen, raised and maintained at his own charge. If indeed there were grave churchmen even in those days who were revolted by these achievements in an ecclesiastic (he was still only in deacon's orders), the sentiment was by no means universal, nor even dominant. With some his valor and military skill only excited more ardent admiration. One of his biographers bursts out into this extraordinary panegyric on the Archdeacon of Canterbury: "Who can recount the carnage, the desolation, which he made at the head of a strong body of soldiers? He attacked castles, razed towns and cities to the ground, burned down houses and farms without a touch of pity, and never showed the slightest mercy to any one who rose in insurrection against his master's authority."¹

The services of Becket were not unrewarded; the love and gratitude of his sovereign showered honors and emoluments upon him. Among his grants were the wardenship of the Tower of London, the lordship of the castle of Berkhamstead and the honor of Eye, with the service of a hundred and forty knights. Yet

¹ Edward Grim, p. 12.

there must have been other and more prolific sources of his wealth, so lavishly displayed. Through Wealth of Becket. his hands as Chancellor passed almost all grants and royal favors. He was the guardian of all escheated baronies and of all vacant benefices. It is said in his praise that he did not permit the king, as was common, to prolong those vacancies for his own advantage, that they were filled up with as much speed as possible; but it should seem, by subsequent occurrences, that no very strict account was kept of the king's moneys spent by the Chancellor in the king's service and those expended by the Chancellor himself. This seems intimated by the care which he took to secure a general quittance from the chief justiciary of the realm before his elevation to the archbishopric.

But if in his personal habits and occupations Becket lost in some degree the churchman in the secular dignity, was he mindful of the solemn trust imposed upon him by his patron the archbishop, and true to the interests of his order? Did he connive at, or at least did he not resist, any invasion on ecclesiastical immunities, or, as they were called, the liberties of the clergy? did he hold their property absolutely sacred? It is clear that he consented to levy the scutage, raised on the whole realm, on ecclesiastical as well as secular property. All that his friend John of Salisbury can allege in his defence is, that he bitterly repented of having been the minister of this iniquity.¹ "If with

¹ John of Salisbury denies that he sanctioned the rapacity of the king, and urges that he only yielded to necessity. Yet his exile was the just punishment of his guilt. "Tamen quia eum ministrum fuisse iniquitatis non ambigo, jure optimo taliter arbitror puniendum ut eo potissimum puniatur auctore, quem in talibus Deo bonorum omnium auctori præferebat. . . . Sed esto: nunc pœnitentiam agit, agnoscit et confitetur culpam pro ea, et

Saul he persecuted the Church, with Paul he is prepared to die for the Church." But probably the worst effect of this conduct as regards King Henry was the encouragement of his fatal delusion that, as archbishop, Becket would be as submissive to his wishes in the affairs of the Church as had been the pliant Chancellor. It was the last and crowning mark of the royal confidence that Becket was intrusted with the education of the young Prince Henry, the heir to all the dominions of the king.

Six years after the accession of Henry II. died Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury. On the char- April, 1161.
acter of his successor depended the peace of the realm, especially if Henry, as no doubt he did, already entertained designs of limiting the exorbitant power of the Church. Becket, ever at his right hand, could not but occur to the mind of the king. Nothing in his habits of life or conduct could impair the hope that in him the loyal, the devoted, it might seem unscrupulous subject, would predominate over the rigid churchman. With such a prime minister, attached by former benefits, it might seem by the warmest personal love, still more by this last proof of boundless confidence, to his person, and as holding the united offices of Chancellor and Primate, ruling supreme both in Church and State, the king could dread no resistance, or if there were resistance, could subdue it without difficulty.

Rumor had already designated Becket as the future primate. A churchman, the Prior of Leicester, on a visit to Becket, who was ill at Rouen, pointing to his apparel, said, "Is this a dress for an Archbishop of

si cum Saulo quandoque ecclesiam impugnavit, nunc, cum Paulo ponere paratus est animam suam." — Bouquet, p. 518.

Canterbury?" Becket himself had not disguised his hopes and fears. "There are three poor priests in England, any one of whose elevation to the see of Canterbury I should wish rather than my own. I know the very heart of the king; if I should be promoted, I must forfeit his favor or that of God."¹

The king did not suddenly declare his intentions. The see was vacant for above a year,² and the administration of the revenues must have been in the department of the Chancellor. At length as Becket, who had received a commission to return to England on other affairs of moment, took leave of his sovereign at Falaise, Henry hastily informed him that those affairs were not the main object of his mission to England — it was for his election to the vacant archbishopric. Becket remonstrated, but in vain; he openly warned, it is said, his royal master that as Primate he must choose between the favor of God and that of the king — he must prefer that of God.³ In those days the interests of the clergy and of God were held inseparable. Henry no doubt thought this but the decent resistance of an ambitious prelate. The advice of Henry of Pisa, the Papal Legate, overcame the faint

¹ Fitz-Stephen, p. 193.

² Theobald died April 18, 1161. Becket was ordained priest and consecrated on Whitsunday, 1162.

³ Yet Theobald, according to John of Salisbury, designed Becket for his successor, —

"hunc (*i. e.* Becket Cancellarium) successorum sibi sperat et orat,
Ille est carnificum qui jus cancellat iniquum,
Quos habuit reges Anglia capta diu,
Esse putans reges, quos est perpessa, tyrannos
Plus veneratur eos, qui nocuere magis."

Entheticus, l. 1295.

Did Becket decide against the Norman laws by the Anglo-Saxon? Has any one guessed the meaning of the rest of John's verses on the Chancellor and his Court? I confess myself baffled.

and lingering scruples of Becket: he passed to England with the king's recommendation, mandate it might be called, for his election.

All which to the king would designate Becket as the future primate could not but excite the apprehensions of the more rigorous churchmen. The monks of Canterbury, with whom rested the formal election, alleged as an insuperable difficulty that Becket had never worn the monastic habit, as almost all his predecessors had done.¹ The suffragan bishops would no doubt secretly resist the advancement, over all their heads, of a man who, latterly at least, had been more of a soldier, a courtier, and a lay statesman. Nor could the prophetic sagacity of any but the wisest discern the latent churchmanship in the ambitious and inflexible heart of Becket. It is recorded on authority, which I do not believe doubtful as to its authenticity, but which is the impassioned statement of a declared enemy, that nothing but the arrival of the great justiciary, Richard de Luci, with the king's peremptory commands, and with personal menaces of proscription and exile against the more forward opponents, awed the refractory monks and prelates to submission.

At Whitsuntide, Thomas Becket received priest's orders, and was then consecrated Primate of England with great magnificence in the Abbey of Westminster. The see of London being vacant, the ceremony was performed by the once turbulent, now aged and peaceful, Henry of Winchester, the brother of King Stephen. One voice alone, that of Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford,² broke the apparent harmony by a bitter sar-

¹ Roger de Pontigny, p. 100.

² In the memorable letter of Gilbert Foliot. Dr. Lingard observes that

casm — “The king has wrought a miracle; he has turned a soldier and a layman into an archbishop.”

Gilbert
Foliot.

Gilbert Foliot, from first to last the firm and unawed antagonist of Becket, is too important a personage to be passed lightly by.¹ This sally was attributed no doubt by some at the time, as it was the subject afterwards of many fierce taunts from Becket himself, and of lofty vindication by Foliot, to disappointed ambition, as though he himself aspired to the primacy. Nor was there an ecclesiastic in England who might entertain more just hopes of advancement. He was admitted to be a man of unimpeachable life, of austere habits, and great learning. He had been Abbot of Gloucester and then Bishop of Hereford. He was in correspondence with four successive Popes, Cœlestine II., Lucius II., Eugenius III., Alexander, and with a familiarity which implies a high estimation for ability and experience. He is interfering in matters remote from his diocese, and commending other bishops, Lincoln and Salisbury, to the favorable consideration of the Pontiff. All his letters reveal as imperious and

Mr. Berington has proved this letter to be spurious. I cannot see any force in Mr. Berington's arguments, and should certainly have paid more deference to Dr. Lingard himself if he had examined the question. It seems, moreover (if I rightly understand Dr. Giles, and I am not certain that I do), that it exists in more than one MS. of Foliot's letters. He has printed it as unquestioned; no very satisfactory proceeding in an editor. The conclusive argument for its authenticity with me is this: Who, after Becket's death and canonization, would have ventured or thought it worth while to forge such a letter? To whom was Foliot's memory so dear, or Becket's so hateful, as to reopen the whole strife about his election and his conduct? Besides, it seems clear that it is either a rejoinder to the long letter addressed by Becket to the clergy of England (Giles, iii. 170), or that letter is a rejoinder to Foliot's. Each is a violent party pamphlet against the other, and of great ability and labor.

¹ Foliot's nearest relatives, if not himself, were Scotch; one of them had forfeited his estate for fidelity to the King of Scotland. — Epist. ii. cclxxviii.

conscientious a churchman as Becket himself, and in Becket's position Foliot might have resisted the king as inflexibly.¹ He was, in short, a bold and stirring ecclesiastic, who did not scruple to wield, as he had done in several instances, that last terrible weapon of the clergy which burst on his own head, excommunication.² It may be added that, notwithstanding his sarcasm, there was no open breach between him and Becket. The primate acquiesced in, if he did not promote, the advancement of Foliot to the see of London;³ and during that period letters of courtesy which borders on adulation were interchanged at least with apparent sincerity.⁴

The king had indeed wrought a greater miracle than himself intended, or than Foliot thought possible. Becket became at once not merely a decent prelate, but an austere and mortified monk: he seemed determined to make up for his want of ascetic qualifications; to crowd a whole life of monkhood into a few years.⁵ Under his canonical dress he wore a monk's frock, hair-cloth next his skin; his studies, his devotions, were

¹ Read his letters before his elevation to the see of London.

² See, *e.g.*, Epist. cxxxi., in which he informs Archbishop Theobald that the Earl of Hereford held intercourse with William Beauchamp, excommunicated by the Primate. "Vileseit anathematis autoritas, nisi et communicantes excommunicatis corripiat digna severitas." The Earl of Hereford must be placed under anathema.

³ Lambeth. p. 91. The election of the Bishop of Hereford to London is confirmed by the Pope's permission to elect him (March 19) *rogatu H. regis et Archiep. Cantuarensis*. A letter from Pope Alexander on his promotion rebukes him for *fasting too severely*. — Epist. ccclix.

⁴ Foliot, in a letter to Pope Alexander, maintains the superiority of Canterbury over York. — cxlix.

⁵ See on the change in his habits, Lambeth. p. 84; also the strange story, in Grim, of a monk who declared himself commissioned by a preterhuman person of terrible countenance to warn the Chancellor not to dare to appear in the choir, as he had done, in a secular dress. — p. 16

long, regular, rigid. At the mass he was frequently melted into passionate tears. In his outward demeanor, indeed, though he submitted to private flagellation, and the most severe macerations, Becket was still the stately prelate; his food, though scanty to abstemiousness, was, as his constitution required, more delicate; his charities were boundless. Archbishop Theobald had doubled the usual amount of the primate's alms, Becket again doubled that; and every night in privacy, no doubt more ostentatious than the most public exhibition, with his own hands he washed the feet of thirteen beggars. His table was still hospitable and sumptuous, but instead of knights and nobles, he admitted only learned clerks, and especially the regulars, whom he courted with the most obsequious deference. For the sprightly conversation of former times were read grave books in the Latin of the church.

But the change was not alone in his habits and mode of life. The King could not have reproved, he might have admired, the most punctilious regard for the decency and the dignity of the highest ecclesiastic in the realm. But the inflexible churchman began to betray himself in more unexpected acts. While still in France Henry was startled at receiving a peremptory resignation of the chancellorship, as inconsistent with the religious functions of the primate. This act was as it were a bill of divorce from all personal intimacy with the king, a dissolution of their old familiar and friendly intercourse. It was not merely that the holy and austere prelate withdrew from the unbecoming pleasures of the court, the chase, the banquet, the tournament, even the war; they were no more to meet at the council board, and the seat of judicature. It had been said

that Becket was co-sovereign with the king, he now appeared (and there were not wanting secret and invidious enemies to suggest, and to inflame the suspicion) a rival sovereign.¹ The king, when Becket met him on his landing at Southampton, did not attempt to conceal his dissatisfaction; his reception of his old friend was cold.

It were unjust to human nature to suppose that it did not cost Becket a violent struggle, a painful sacrifice, thus as it were to rend himself from the familiarity and friendship of his munificent benefactor. It was no doubt a severe sense of duty which crushed his natural affections, especially as vulgar ambition must have pointed out a more sure and safe way to power and fame. Such ambition would hardly have hesitated between the ruling all orders through the king, and the solitary and dangerous position of opposing so powerful a monarch to maintain the interests and secure the favor of one order alone.

Henry was now fully occupied with the affairs of Wales. Becket, with the royal sanction, obeyed the summons of Pope Alexander to the Council of Tours. Becket had passed through part of France at the head of an army of his own raising, and under his command; he had passed a second time as representing the king, he was yet to pass as an exile. At Tours, where Pope Alexander now held his court, and pre-
Becket at
Tours.
May 19, 1163.
sided over his Council, Becket appeared at the head of all the Bishops of England, except those

¹ Compare the letter of the politic Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux: "*Si enim favori divino favorem præferretis humanum, poteratis non solum cum summâ tranquillitate degere, sed ipso etiam magis quam olim, Principe conregnare.*" — *Apud Bouquet*, xvi. p. 229.

excused on account of age or infirmity. So great was his reputation, that the Pope sent out all the cardinals except those in attendance on his own person to escort the primate of England into the city. In the council at Tours not merely was the title of Alexander to the popedom avouched with perfect unanimity, but the rights and privileges of the clergy asserted with more than usual rigor and distinctness. Some canons, one especially which severely condemned all encroachments on the property of the Church, might seem framed almost with a view to the impending strife with England.

That strife, so impetuous might seem the combatants to join issue, broke out, during the next year, in all its violence. Both parties, if they did not commence, were prepared for aggression. The first occasion of public collision was a dispute concerning the customary payment of the ancient Danegelt, of two shillings on every hide of land, to the sheriffs of the several counties. The king determined to transfer this payment to his own exchequer: he summoned an assembly at Woodstock, and declared his intentions. All were mute but Becket; the archbishop opposed the enrolment of the decree, on the ground that the tax was voluntary, not of right. "By the eyes of God," said Henry, his usual oath, "it shall be enrolled!" "By the same eyes, by which you swear," replied the prelate, "it shall never be levied on my lands while I live!"¹ On Becket's part, almost the first act of his primacy was to vindicate all the rights,

¹ This strange scene is recorded by Roger de Pontigny, who received his information on all those circumstances from Becket himself, or from his followers. See also Grim, p. 22.

and to resume all the property which had been usurped, or which he asserted to have been usurped, from his see.¹ It was not likely that, in the turbulent times just gone by, there would have been rigid respect for the inviolability of sacred property. The title of the Church was held to be indefeasible. Whatever had once belonged to the Church might be recovered at any time; and the ecclesiastical courts claimed the sole right of adjudication in such causes. The primate was thus at once plaintiff, judge, and carried into execution his own judgments. The lord of the manor of Eynsford in Kent, who held of the king, claimed the right of presentation to that benefice. Becket asserted the prerogative of the see of Canterbury. On the forcible ejection of his nominee by the lord, William of Eynsford, Becket proceeded at once to a sentence of excommunication, without regard to Eynsford's feudal superior the king. The primate next demanded the castle of Tunbridge from the head of the powerful family of De Clare; though it had been held by De Clare, and it was asserted, received in exchange for a Norman castle, since the time of William the Conqueror. The attack on De Clare might seem a defiance of the whole feudal nobility; a determination to despoil them of their conquests, or grants from the sovereign.

The king, on his side, wisely chose the strongest and more popular ground of the immunities of the clergy from all temporal jurisdiction. He appeared as guar-

¹ Becket had been compelled to give up the rich archdeaconry of Canterbury, which he seemed disposed to hold with the archbishopric. Geoffrey Ridel, who became archdeacon, was afterwards one of his most active enemies.

dian of the public morals, as administrator of equal justice to all his subjects, as protector of the peace of the realm. Crimes of great atrocity, it is said, of great frequency, crimes such as robbery and homicide, crimes for which secular persons were hanged by scores and without mercy, were committed almost with impunity, or with punishment altogether inadequate to the offence by the clergy; and the sacred name of clerk, exempted not only bishops, abbots, and priests, but those of the lowest ecclesiastical rank from the civil power. It was the inalienable right of the clerk to be tried only in the court of his bishop; and as that court could not award capital punishment, the utmost penalties were flagellation, imprisonment, and degradation. It was only after degradation, and for a second offence (for the clergy strenuously insisted on the injustice of a second trial for the same act),¹ that the meanest of the clerical body could be brought to the level of the most highborn layman. But to cede one tittle of these immunities, to surrender the sacred person of a clergyman, whatever his guilt, to the secular power, was treason to the sacerdotal order: it was giving up Christ (for the Redeemer was supposed actually to dwell in the clerk, though his hands might be stained with innocent blood) to be crucified by the heathen.² To mutilate the person of one in holy orders was directly contrary to the Scripture (for with

¹ The king was willing that the clerk guilty of murder or robbery should be degraded before he was hanged, but hanged he should be. The archbishop insisted that he should be safe "a læsione membrorum." Degradation was in itself so dreadful a punishment, that to hang also for the same crime was a double penalty. "If he returned to his vomit," after degradation, "he might be hanged." — Compare Grim, p. 30.

² "De novo judicatur Christus ante Pilatum præsidem." — De Bosham, p. 117.

convenient logic, while the clergy rejected the example of the Old Testament as to the equal liability of priest and Levite with the ordinary Jew to the sentence of the law, they alleged it on their own part as unanswerable). It was inconceivable, that hands which had but now made God should be tied behind the back, like those of a common malefactor, or that his neck should be wrung on a gibbet, before whom kings had but now bowed in reverential homage.¹

The enormity of the evil is acknowledged by Becket's most ardent partisans.² The king had credible information laid before him that some of the clergy were absolute devils in guilt, that their wickedness could not be repressed by the ordinary means of justice, and were daily growing worse.

Becket himself had protected some notorious and heinous offenders. A clerk of the diocese of Worcester had debauched a maiden and murdered her father. Becket ordered the man to be kept in prison, and refused to surrender him to the king's justice.³ Another in London, guilty of stealing a silver goblet, was

¹ De Bosham, p. 100.

² The fairness with which the question is stated by Herbert de Bosham, the follower, almost the worshipper of Becket, is remarkable. "*Aretabatur itaque rex, aretabatur et pontifex. Rex etenim populi sui pacem, sicut archipræsul cleri sui zelans libertatim, audiens sic et videns et ad multorum relationes et querimonias accipiens, per hujuscemodi castigationes, talium clericorum inno verius caracterizatorum, demonum flagitia non reprimi vel potius indes per regnum deterius fieri.*" He proceeds to state at length the argument on both sides. Another biographer of Becket makes strong admissions of the crimes of the clergy: "*Sed et ordinatum inordinati mores, inter regem et archiepiscopum auxere malitiam, qui solito abundantius per idem tempus apparebant publicis irretiti criminibus.*" — Edw. Grim. It was said that no less than 100 of the clergy were charged with homicide.

³ This, according to Fitz-Stephen, was the first cause of quarrel with the king. p. 215.

claimed as only amenable to the ecclesiastical court. Philip de Brois, a canon of Bedford, had been guilty of homicide. The cause was tried in the bishop's court; he was condemned to pay a fine to the kindred of the slain man. Some time after, Fitz-Peter, the king's justiciary, whether from private enmity or offence, or dissatisfied with the ecclesiastical verdict, in the open court at Dunstable, called De Brois a murderer. De Brois broke out into angry and contumelious language against the judge. The insult to the justiciary was held to be insult to the king, who sought justice, where alone he could obtain it, in the bishop's court. Philip de Brois this time incurred a sentence, to our notions almost as disproportionate as that for his former offence. He was condemned to be publicly whipped, and degraded for two years from the honors and emoluments of his canonry. But to the king the verdict appeared far too lenient; the spiritual jurisdiction was accused as shielding the criminal from his due penalty.

Such were the questions on which Becket was prepared to confront and to wage war to the death with the king; and all this with a deliberate knowledge both of the power and the character of Henry, his power as undisputed sovereign of England and of Continental territories more extensive and flourishing than those of the king of France. These dominions included those of the Conqueror and his descendants, of the Counts of Anjou, and the great inheritance of his wife, Queen Eleanor, the old kingdom of Aquitaine; they reached from the borders of Flanders round to the foot of the Pyrenees. This almost unrivalled power could not but have worked with the

Character of
the King.

strong natural passions of Henry to form the character drawn by a churchman of great ability, who would warn Becket as to the formidable adversary whom he had undertaken to oppose, — “ You have to deal with one on whose policy the most distant sovereigns of Europe, on whose power his neighbors, on whose severity his subjects look with awe; whom constant successes and prosperous fortune have rendered so sensitive, that every act of disobedience is a personal outrage; whom it is as easy to provoke as difficult to appease; who encourages no rash offence by impunity, but whose vengeance is instant and summary. He will sometimes be softened by humility and patience, but will never submit to compulsion; everything must seem to be conceded by his own free will, nothing wrested from his weakness. He is more covetous of glory than of gain, a commendable quality in a prince, if virtue and truth, not the vanity and soft flattery of courtiers, awarded that glory. He is a great, indeed the greatest of kings, for he has no superior of whom he may stand in dread, no subject who dares to resist him. His natural ferocity has been subdued by no calamity from without; all who have been involved in any contest with him, have preferred the most precarious treaty to a trial of strength with one so preëminent in wealth, in the number of his forces, and the greatness of his puissance.”¹

A king of this character would eagerly listen to suggestions of interested or flattering courtiers, that unless

¹ See throughout this epistle of Arnulf of Lisieux, Bouquet, p. 230. This same Arnulf was a crafty and double-dealing prelate. Grim and Roger de Pontigny say that he suggested to Henry the policy of making a party against Becket among the English bishops, while to Becket he plays the part of confidential counsellor. — Grim, p. 29. R. P., p. 119. Will. Cantorb., p. 6. Compare on Arnulf, Epist. 346, v. 11, p. 189.

the Primate's power were limited, the authority of the king would be reduced to nothing. The succession to the throne would depend entirely on the clergy, and he himself would reign only so long as might seem good to the Archbishop. Nor were they the baser courtiers alone who feared and hated Becket. The nobles might tremble from the example of De Clare, with whose powerful house almost all the Norman baronage was allied, lest every royal grant should be called in question.¹ Even among the clergy Becket had bitter enemies; and though at first they appeared almost as jealous as the Primate for the privileges of their order, the most able soon espoused the cause of the King; those who secretly favored him were obliged to submit in silence.

The King, determined to bring these great questions to issue, summoned a Parliament at Westminster. He commenced the proceedings by enlarging on the abuses of the archidiaconal courts. The archdeacons kept the most watchful and inquisitorial superintendence over the laity, but every offence was easily commuted for a pecuniary fine, which fell to them. The King complained that they levied a revenue from the sins of the people equal to his own, yet that the public morals were only more deeply and irretrievably depraved. He then demanded that all clerks accused of heinous crimes should be immediately degraded and handed over to the officers of his justice, to be dealt with according to law; for their guilt, instead of deserving a lighter punishment, was doubly guilty: he demanded this in the name of equal justice and the

¹ These are the words which Fitz-Stephen places in the mouths of the king's courtiers.

peace of the realm. Becket insisted on delay till the next morning, in order that he might consult his suffragan bishops. This the King refused: the bishops withdrew to confer upon their answer. The bishops were disposed to yield, some doubtless impressed with the justice of the demand, some from fear of the King, some from a prudent conviction of the danger of provoking so powerful a monarch, and of involving the Church in a quarrel with Henry at the perilous time of a contest for the Papacy which distracted Europe. Becket inflexibly maintained the inviolability of the holy persons of the clergy.¹ The King then demanded whether they would observe the "customs of the realm." "Saving my order," replied the Archbishop. That order was still to be exempt from all jurisdiction but its own. So answered all the bishops except Hilary of Chichester, who made the declaration without reserve.² The King hastily broke up the assembly, and left London in a state of consternation, the people and the clergy agitated by conflicting anxieties. He immediately deprived Becket of the custody of the Royal Castles, which he still retained, and of the momentous charge, the education of his son. The bishops entreated Becket either to withdraw or to change the offensive word. At first he declared that if an angel from Heaven should counsel such weakness, he would hold him accursed. At length, however, he yielded, as Herbert de Bosham asserts, out of love for the king,³ by another account at the persuasion of the Pope's Almoner, said to have been bribed by Eng-

¹ Herbert de Bosham, p. 109. Fitz-Stephen, p. 209, *et seq.*

² "Dicens se observaturos regias consuetudines bonâ fide."

³ Compare W. Canterb., p. 6.

lish gold.¹ He went to Oxford and made the concession.

The King, in order to ratify with the utmost solemnity the concession extorted from the bishops, and even from Becket himself, summoned a great council of the realm to Clarendon, a royal palace between three and four miles from Salisbury. The two archbishops and eleven bishops, between thirty and forty of the highest nobles, with numbers of inferior barons, were present. It was the King's object to settle beyond dispute the main points in contest between the Crown and the Church; to establish thus, with the consent of the whole nation, an English Constitution in Church and State. Becket, it is said, had been assured by some about the King that a mere assent would be demanded to vague and ambiguous, and therefore on occasion disputable customs. But when these customs, which had been collected and put in writing by the King's order, appeared in the form of precise and binding laws, drawn up with legal technicality by the Chief Justiciary, he saw his error, wavered, and endeavored to recede.² The King broke out into one of his ungovernable fits of passion. One or two of the bishops who were out of favor with the King and two knights Templars on their knees implored Becket to abandon his dangerous, fruitless, and ill-timed resistance. The Archbishop took the oath,

¹ Grim, p. 29.

² Dr. Lingard supposes that Becket demanded that the customs should be reduced to writing. This seems quite contrary to his policy; and Edward Grim writes thus: "Nam domestici regis, dato consentiente consilio, securum fecerant archiepiscopum, quod *nunquam scriberentur* leges, nunquam illarum fieret recordatio, si eum verbo tantum in audientiâ procerum honorâsset," &c. — P. 31.

which had been already sworn to by all the lay barons. He was followed by the rest of the bishops, reluctantly according to one account, and compelled on one side by their dread of the lay barons, on the other by the example and authority of the Primate, according to Becket's biographers, eagerly and of their own accord.¹

These famous constitutions were of course feudal in their form and spirit. But they aimed at the subjection of all the great prelates of the realm Constitutions of Clarendon. to the Crown to the same extent as the great barons. The new constitution of England made the bishops' fiefs to be granted according to the royal will, and subjected the whole of the clergy equally with the laity to the common laws of the land.² I. On the vacancy of every archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, the revenues came into the King's hands. He was to summon those who had the right of election, which was to take place in the King's Chapel, with his consent, and the counsel of nobles chosen by the King for this office. The prelate elect was immediately to do homage to the King as his liege lord, for life, limb, and worldly honors, excepting his order. The archbishops, bishops, and all beneficiaries, held their estates on the tenure of baronies, amenable to the King's justice, and bound to sit with the other barons in all pleas of the Crown, except in capital cases. No archbishop, bishop, or any other person could quit the realm without royal permission, or without taking an oath at the King's requisition, not to do any damage, either going, staying, or returning, to the King or the kingdom.

¹ See the letter of Gilbert Foliot, of which I do not doubt the authenticity.

² According to the Cottonian copy, published by Lord Lyttelton, *Constitutions* xii. xv. iv.

II. All clerks accused of any crime were to be summoned before the King's Courts. The King's justiciaries were to decide whether it was a case for civil or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Those which belonged to the latter were to be removed to the Bishops' Court. If the clerk was found guilty or confessed his guilt, the Church could protect him no longer.¹

III. All disputes concerning advowsons and presentations to benefices were to be decided in the King's Courts; and the King's consent was necessary for the appointment to any benefice within the King's domain.²

IV. No tenant in chief of the King, none of the officers of the King's household, could be excommunicated, nor his lands placed under interdict, until due information had been laid before the King; or, in his absence from the realm, before the great Justiciary, in order that he might determine in each case the respective rights of the civil and ecclesiastical courts.³

V. Appeals lay from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the Archbishop. On failure of justice by the Archbishop, in the last resort to the King, who was to take care that justice was done in the Archbishop's Court; and no further appeal was to be made without the King's consent. This was manifestly and avowedly intended to limit appeals to Rome.

All these statutes, in number sixteen, were restrictions on the distinctive immunities of the clergy: one, and that unnoticed, was really an invasion of popular freedom; no son of a villein could be ordained without the consent of his lord.

¹ Constitution iii.

² Constitutions i. and ii.

³ Constitution vii., somewhat limited and explained by x.

Some of these customs were of doubtful authenticity. On the main question, the exorbitant powers of the ecclesiastical courts and the immunity of the clergy from all other jurisdiction, there was an unrepealed statute of William the Conqueror. Before the Conquest the bishop sat with the alderman in the same court. The statute of William created a separate jurisdiction of great extent in the spiritual court. This was not done to aggrandize the Church, of which in some respects the Conqueror was jealous, but to elevate the importance of the great Norman prelates whom he had thrust into the English sees. It raised another class of powerful feudatories to support the foreign throne, bound to it by common interest as well as by the attachment of race. But at this time neither party took any notice of the ancient statute. The King's advisers of course avoided the dangerous question; Becket and the Churchmen (Becket himself declared that he was unlearned in the customs), standing on the divine and indefeasible right of the clergy, could hardly rest on a recent statute granted by the royal will, and therefore liable to be annulled by the same authority. The Customs, they averred, were of themselves illegal, as clashing with higher irrevocable laws.

To these Customs Becket had now sworn without reserve. Three copies were ordered to be made — one for the Archbishop of Canterbury, one for York, one to be laid up in the royal archives. To these the King demanded the further guarantee of the seal of the different parties. The Primate, whether already repenting of his assent, or under the vague impression that this was committing himself still further (for oaths might be absolved, seals could not be torn from public

documents), now obstinately refused to make any further concession. The refusal threw suspicion on the sincerity of his former act. The King, the other prelates, the nobles, all but Becket,¹ subscribed and sealed the Constitutions of Clarendon as the laws of England.

As the Primate rode from Winchester in profound silence, meditating on the acts of the council and on his own conduct, one of his attendants, who has himself related the conversation, endeavored to raise his spirits. "It is a fit punishment," said Becket, "for one who, not trained in the school of the Saviour, but in the King's court, a man of pride and vanity, from a follower of hawks and hounds, a patron of players, has dared to assume the care of so many souls."² De Bosham significantly reminded his master of St. Peter, his denial of the Lord, his subsequent repentance. On his return to Canterbury Becket imposed upon himself the severest mortification, and suspended himself from his function of offering the sacrifice on the altar. He
 April 1. wrote almost immediately to the Pope to seek counsel and absolution from his oath. He received both. The absolution restored all his vivacity.

But the King had likewise his emissaries with the Pope at Sens. He endeavored to obtain a legatine commission over the whole realm of England for Becket's enemy, Roger Archbishop of York, and a recommendation from the Pope to Becket to observe the "customs" of the realm. Two embassies were sent

¹ Herbert de Bosham. "Caute quidam non de plano negat, sed differendum dicebat adhuc."

² "Superbus et vanus, de pastore avium factus sum pastor ovium; dudum fautor histrionum et eorum sectator tot animarum pastor." — De Bosham, p. 126.

by the King for this end: first the Bishops of Lisieux and Poitiers; then Geoffrey Ridel, Archdeacon of Canterbury (who afterwards appears so hostile to the Primate as to be called by him that archdevil, not archdeacon), and the subtle John of Oxford. The embarrassed Pope (throughout it must be remembered that there was a formidable Antipope), afraid at once of estranging Henry, and unwilling to abandon Becket, granted the legation to the Archbishop of York. To the Primate's great indignation, Roger had his cross borne before him in the Province of Canterbury. On Becket's angry remonstrance, the Pope, while on the one hand he enjoined on Becket the greatest caution and forbearance in the inevitable contest, assured him that he would never permit the see of Canterbury to be subject to any authority but his own.¹

Becket secretly went down to his estate at Romney, near the sea-coast, in the hope of crossing the straits, and so finding refuge and maintaining his cause by his personal presence with the Pope. Stormy weather forced him to abandon his design. He then betook himself to the King at Woodstock. He was coldly

¹ Read the Epistles, apud Giles, v. iv. 1, 3. Bouquet, xvi. 210, to judge of the skilful steering and difficulties of the Pope. There is a very curious letter of an emissary of Becket, describing the death of the Antipope (he died at Lucca, April 21). The canons of San Frediano, in Lucca, refused to bury him, because he was already "buried in hell." The writer announces that the Emperor also was ill, that the Empress had miscarried, and that therefore all France adhered with greater devotion to Alexander; and the *Legatine commission to the Archbishop of York had expired without hope of recovery*. The writer ventures, however, to suggest to Becket to conduct himself with modesty; to seek rather than avoid intercourse with the king. — Apud Giles, iv. 240; Bouquet, p. 210. See also the letter of John, Bishop of Poitiers, who says of the Pope, "*Gravi redimit pœnitentiâ, illum qualem qualem quam Eboracensi (fecerit), concessionem.*" — Bouquet, p. 214.

received. The King at first dissembled his knowledge of the Primate's attempt to cross the sea, a direct violation of one of the constitutions; but on his departure he asked with bitter jocularly whether Becket had sought to leave the realm because England could not contain himself and the King.¹

The tergiversation of Becket, and his attempt thus to violate one of the Constitutions of Clarendon, to which he had sworn, showed that he was not to be bound by oaths. No treaty could be made where one party claimed the power of retracting, and might at any time be released from his covenant. In the mind of Henry, whose will had never yet met resistance, the determination was confirmed, if he could not subdue the Prelate, to crush the refractory subject. Becket's enemies possessed the King's ear. Some of those enemies no doubt hated him for his former favor with the King, some dreaded lest the severity of so inflexible a prelate should curb their license, some held property belonging to or claimed by the Church, some to flatter the King, some in honest indignation at the duplicity of Becket, and in love of peace, but all concurred to inflame the resentment of Henry, and to attribute to Becket words and designs insulting to the King and disparaging to the royal authority. Becket, holding such notions as he did of Church power, would not be cautious in asserting it; and whatever he might utter in his pride would be imbittered rather than softened when repeated to the King.

Since the Council of Clarendon, Becket stood alone.

¹ I follow De Bosham. Fitz-Stephen says that he was repelled from the gates of the king's palace at Woodstock; and that he *afterwards* went to Romney to attempt to cross the sea.

All the higher clergy, the great prelates of the kingdom, were now either his open adversaries or were compelled to dissemble their favor towards him. Whether alienated, as some declared, by his pusillanimity at Clarendon, bribed by the gifts, or overawed by the power of the King, whether conscientiously convinced that in such times of schism and division it might be fatal to the interests of the Church to advance her loftiest pretensions, all, especially the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Salisbury, and Chichester, were arrayed on the King's side. Becket himself attributed the chief guilt of his persecution to the bishops. "The King would have been quiet if they had not been so tamely subservient to his wishes."¹

Before the close of the year Becket was cited to appear before a great council of the realm at Parliament at Northampton. Northampton. All England crowded to wit- Oct. 6, 1164. ness this final strife, it might be, between the royal and the ecclesiastical power. The Primate entered Northampton with only his own retinue; the King had passed the afternoon amusing himself with hawking in the pleasant meadows around. The Archbishop, on the following morning after mass, appeared in the King's chamber with a cheerful countenance. The King gave not, according to English custom, the kiss of peace.

The citation of the Primate before the King in council at Northampton was to answer a charge of withholding justice from John the Marshall employed in the king's exchequer, who claimed the estate of Pagham from the see of Canterbury. Twice had Becket

¹ "Quievisset ille, si non acquievisset illi." — Becket, Epist. ii. p. 5.
Compare the whole letter.

been summoned to appear in the king's court to answer for this denial of justice: once he had refused to appear, the second time he did not appear in person. Becket in vain alleged an informality in the original proceedings of John the Marshall.¹ The court, the bishops, as well as the barons, declared him guilty of contumacy; all his goods and chattels became, according to the legal phrase, at the king's mercy.² The fine was assessed at 500 pounds. Becket submitted, not without bitter irony: "This, then, is one of the new customs of Clarendon." But he protested against the unheard-of audacity that the bishops should presume to sit in judgment on their spiritual parent; it was a greater crime than to uncover their father's nakedness.³ Sarcasms and protests passed alike without notice. But the bishops, all except Foliot, consented to become sureties for this exorbitant fine. Demands rising one above another seemed framed for the purpose of reducing the Archbishop to the humiliating condition of a debtor to the King, entirely at his disposal. First 300 pounds were demanded as due from the castles of Eye and Berkhamstead. Becket pleaded that he had expended a much larger sum on the repairs of the castles: he found sureties likewise for this payment, the Earl of Gloucester, William of Eynsford, and another of "his men." The next day the demand was for 500 pounds lent by the King during the siege of Toulouse. Becket declared that this

Demands on
Becket.

¹ He had been sworn not on the Gospels, but on a tropologium, a book of church music.

² Goods and chattels at the king's mercy were redeemable at a customary fine: this fine, according to the customs of Kent, would have been larger than according to those of London. — Fitz-Stephen.

³ "Minus fore malum verenda patris detecta deridere, quam patris ipsius personam judicare." — De Bosham, p. 135.

was a gift, not a loan ;¹ but the King denying the plea, judgment was again entered against Becket. At last came the overwhelming charge, an account of all the moneys received during his chancellorship from the vacant archbishopric and from other bishoprics and abbeys. The debt was calculated at the enormous sum of 44,000 marks. Becket was astounded at this unexpected claim. As chancellor, in all likelihood, he had kept no very strict account of what was expended in his own and in the royal service ; and the King seemed blind to this abuse of the royal right, by which so large a sum had accumulated by keeping open those benefices which ought to have been instantly filled. Becket, recovered from his first amazement, replied that he had not been cited to answer on such charge ; at another time he should be prepared to answer all just demands of the Crown. He now requested delay, in order to advise with his suffragans and the clergy. He withdrew ; but from that time no single baron visited the object of the royal disfavor. Becket assembled all the poor, even the beggars, who could be found, to fill his vacant board.

In his extreme exigency the Primate consulted separately first the bishops, then the abbots. ^{Takes counsel with the} Their advice was different according to their ^{bishops.} characters and their sentiments towards him. He had what might seem an unanswerable plea, a formal acquittance from the chief Justiciary De Luci, the King's representative, for all obligations incurred in his civil capacity before his consecration as archbishop.² The

¹ Fitz-Stephen states this demand at 500 marks, and a second 500 for which a bond had been given to a Jew.

² Neither party denied this acquittance given in the King's name by the

King, however, it was known, declared that he had given no such authority. Becket had the further excuse that all which he now possessed was the property of the Church, and could not be made liable for responsibilities incurred in a secular capacity. The bishops, however, were either convinced of the insufficiency or the inadmissibility of that plea. Henry of Winchester recommended an endeavor to purchase the King's pardon; he offered 2000 marks as his contribution. Others urged Becket to stand on his dignity, to defy the worst, under the shelter of his priesthood; no one would venture to lay hands on a holy prelate. Foliot and his party betrayed their object.¹ They exhorted him as the only way of averting the implacable wrath of the King at once to resign his see. "Would," said Hilary of Chichester, "you were no longer archbishop, but plain Thomas. Thou knowest the King better than we do; he has declared that thou and he cannot remain together in England, he as King, thou as Primate. Who will be bound for such an amount? Throw thyself on the King's mercy, or to the eternal disgrace of the Church thou wilt be arrested and imprisoned as a debtor to the Crown." The next day was Sunday; the Archbishop did not leave his lodg

justiciary Richard de Luci. This, it should seem, unusual precaution, or at least this precaution taken with such unusual care, seems to imply some suspicion that, without it, the archbishop was liable to be called to account; an account which probably, from the splendid prodigality with which Becket had lavished the King's money and his own, it might be difficult or inconvenient to produce.

¹ In an account of this affair, written later, Becket accuses Foliot of aspiring to the primacy — "et qui adspirabant ad fastigium ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, ut vulgo dicitur et creditur, in nostram perniciem, utinam minus ambitiosè, quam avidè." This could be none but Foliot. — *Epist. lxxv. p.*
154

ings. On Monday the agitation of his spirits had brought on an attack of a disorder to which he was subject: he was permitted to repose. On the morrow he had determined on his conduct. At one time he had seriously meditated on a more humiliating course: he proposed to seek the royal presence barefooted with the cross in his hands, to throw himself at the King's feet, appealing to his old affection, and imploring him to restore peace to the Church. What had been the effect of such a step on the violent but not ungenerous heart of Henry? But Becket yielded to haughtier counsels more congenial to his own intrepid character. He began by the significant act of celebrating, out of its due order, the service of St. Stephen, the first martyr. It contained passages of holy writ (as no doubt Henry was instantly informed) concerning "kings taking counsel against the godly." The mass concluded; in all the majesty of his holy character, in his full pontifical habits, himself bearing the archiepiscopal cross, the primate rode to the King's residence, and dismounting entered the royal hall. The cross Becket in the King's hall. seemed, as it were, an uplifting of the banner of the Church, in defiance of that of the King, in the royal presence;¹ or it might be in that awful imitation of the Saviour, at which no scruple was ever made by the bolder churchmen—it was the servant of Christ who himself bore his own cross. "What means this new fashion of the Archbishop bearing his own cross?" said the Archdeacon of Lisieux. "A fool," said Foliot,

¹ "Tanquam in prælio Domini, signifer Domini, vexillum Domini erigens: illud etiam Domini non solum spiritualiter, sed et figuraliter implens.

Si quis,' inquit, 'vult meus esse discipulus, abneget semet ipsum, tollat crucem suam et sequatur me.' — De Bosham, p. 143. Compare the letter of the Bishops to the Pope. — Giles, iv. 256; Bouquet, 224.

“he always was and always will be.” They made room for him; he took his accustomed seat in the centre of the bishops. Foliot endeavored to persuade him to lay down the cross. “If the sword of the king and the cross of the archbishop were to come into conflict, which were the more fearful weapon?” Becket held the cross firmly, which Foliot and the Bishop of Hereford strove, but in vain, to wrest from his grasp.

The bishops were summoned into the King’s presence: Becket sat alone in the outer hall. The Archbishop of York, who, as Becket’s partisans asserted, designedly came later that he might appear to be of the King’s intimate council, swept through the hall with his cross borne before him. Like hostile spears cross confronted cross.¹

During this interval De Bosham, the archbishop’s reader, who had reminded his master that he had been standard-bearer of the King of England, and was now the standard-bearer of the King of the Angels, put this question, “If they should lay their impious hands upon thee, art thou prepared to fulminate excommunication against them?” Fitz-Stephen, who sat at his feet, said in a loud clear voice, “That be far from thee; so did not the Apostles and Martyrs of God: they prayed for their persecutors and forgave them.” Some of his more attached followers burst into tears. “A little later,” says the faithful Fitz-Stephen of himself, “when one of the King’s ushers would not allow me to speak to

¹ “Quasi pila minantia pilis,” quotes Fitz-Stephen; “Memento,” said De Bosham, “quondam te extitisse regis Anglorum signiferum inexpugnabilem, nunc vero si signifer regis Angelorum expugnaris, turpissimum.” — p. 146.

the Archbishop, I made a sign to him and drew his attention to the Saviour on the cross."

The bishops admitted to the King's presence announced the appeal of the Archbishop to the Pope, and his inhibition to his suffragans to sit in judgment in a secular council on their metropolitan.¹ These were again direct infringements on two of the constitutions of Clarendon, sworn to by Becket in an oath still held valid by the King and his barons. The King appealed to the council. Some seized the occasion of boldly declaring to the King that he had brought this difficulty on himself by advancing a low-born <sup>Condemna-
tion of
Becket.</sup> man to such favor and dignity. All agreed that Becket was guilty of perjury and treason.² A kind of low acclamation followed which was heard in the outer room and made Becket's followers tremble. The King sent certain counts and barons to demand of Becket whether he, a liegeman of the King, and sworn to observe the constitutions of Clarendon, had lodged this appeal and pronounced this inhibition? The Archbishop replied with quiet intrepidity. In his long speech he did not hesitate for a word: he pleaded that he had not been cited to answer these charges; he alleged again the Justiciary's acquittance; he ended by solemnly renewing his inhibition and his appeal: "My person and my church I place under the protection of the sovereign Pontiff."

The barons of Normandy and England heard with wonder this defiance of the King. Some seemed awe-

¹ Dicebant enim episcopi, quod adhuc, ipsâ die, intra decem dies datæ sententiæ, eos ad dominum Papam appellaverat, et ne de cetero eum judicaret pro seculari querelâ, quæ de tempore ante archipræsulatum ei moveretur, auctoritate domini Papæ prohibuit." — Fitz-Stephen, p. 230.

² Herbert de Bosham, p. 148

struck and were mute ; the more fierce and lawless could not restrain their indignation. "The Conqueror knew best how to deal with these turbulent churchmen. He seized his own brother, Odo Bishop of Bayeux, and chastised him for his rebellion ; he threw Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, into a fetid dungeon. The Count of Anjou, the King's father, treated still worse the bishop elect of Seez and many of his clergy : he ordered them to be shamefully mutilated and derided their sufferings."

The King summoned the bishops, on their allegiance as barons, to join in the sentence against Becket. But the inhibition of their metropolitan had thrown them into embarrassment, and perhaps they felt that the offence of Becket, if not capital treason, bordered upon it. It might be a sentence of blood, in which no churchman might concur by his suffrage — they dreaded the breach of canonical obedience. They entered the hall where Becket sat alone. The gentler prelates, Robert of Lincoln and others, were moved to tears ; even Henry of Winchester advised the archbishop to make an unconditional surrender of his see. The more vehement Hilary of Chichester addressed him thus : "Lord Primate, we have just cause of complaint against you. Your inhibition has placed us between the hammer and the anvil : if we disobey it, we violate our canonical obedience ; if we obey, we infringe the constitutions of the realm and offend the King's majesty. Yourself were the first to subscribe the customs at Clarendon, you now compel us to break them. We appeal, by the King's grace, to our lord the Pope." Becket answered "I hear."

They returned to the King, and with difficulty ob-

tained an exemption from concurrence in the sentence ; they promised to join in a supplication to the Pope to depose Becket. The King permitted their appeal. Robert Earl of Leicester, a grave and aged nobleman, was commissioned to pronounce the sentence. Leicester had hardly begun when Becket sternly interrupted him. "Thy sentence ! son and Earl, hear me first ! The King was pleased to promote me against my will to the archbishopric of Canterbury. I was then declared free from all secular obligations. Ye are my children ; presume ye against law and reason to sit in judgment on your spiritual father ? I am to be judged only, under God, by the Pope. To him I appeal, before him I cite you, barons and my suffragans, to appear. Under the protection of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See I depart !"¹ He rose and walked slowly down the hall. A deep murmur ran through the crowd. Some took up straws and threw them at him. One uttered the word "Traitor !" The old chivalrous spirit woke in the soul of Becket. "Were it not for my order, you should rue that word." But by other accounts he restrained not his language to this pardonable impropriety — he met scorn with scorn. One officer of the King's household he upbraided for having had a kinsman hanged. Anselm, the King's brother, he called "bastard and catamite." The door was locked, but fortunately the key was found. He passed out into the street, where he was received by the populace, to whom he had endeared himself by his charities, his austerities, perhaps by his

¹ De Bosham's account is, that notwithstanding the first interruption, Leicester reluctantly proceeded till he came to the word "perjured," on which Becket rose and spoke.

courageous opposition to the king and the nobles, amid loud acclamations. They pressed so closely around him for his blessing that he could scarcely guide his horse. He returned to the church of St. Andrew, placed his cross by the altar of the Virgin. "This was a fearful day," said Fitz-Stephen. "The day of judgment," he replied, "will be more fearful." After supper he sent the Bishops of Hereford, Worcester, and Rochester to the King to request permission to leave the kingdom: the King coldly deferred his answer till the morrow.

Becket and his friends no doubt thought his life in danger: he is said to have received some alarming warnings.¹ It is reported, on the other hand, that the King, apprehensive of the fierce zeal of his followers, issued a proclamation that no one should do harm to the archbishop or his people. It is more likely that the King, who must have known the peril of attempting the life of an archbishop, would have apprehended and committed him to prison. Becket expressed his intention to pass the night in the church: his bed was strewn before the altar. At midnight he rose, and with only two monks and a servant stole out of the northern gate, the only one which was not guarded. He carried with him only his archiepiscopal pall and his seal. The weather was wet and stormy, but the next morning they reached Lincoln, and lodged with a pious citizen — piety and admiration of Becket were the same thing. At Lincoln he took the disguise of a monk, dropped down the Witham to a hermitage in the fens belonging to the Cistercians of Sempringham; thence by cross-roads, and chiefly by

Flight of
Becket.
Oct. 13.

¹ De Bosham, p. 150.

night, he found his way to Estrey, about five miles from Deal, a manor belonging to Christ Church in Canterbury. He remained there a week. On All Souls Day he went on board a boat, just before morning, and by the evening reached the coast of Flanders. To avoid observation he landed on the open shore near Gravelines. His large, loose shoes made it difficult to wade through the sand without falling. He sat down in despair. After some delay was obtained for a prelate, accustomed to the prancing war-horse or stately cavalcade, a sorry nag without a saddle, and with a wisp of hay for a bridle. But he soon got weary and was fain to walk. He had many adventures by the way. He was once nearly betrayed by gazing with delight on a falcon upon a young squire's wrist: his fright punished him for this relapse into his secular vanities. The host of a small inn recognized him by his lofty look and the whiteness of his hands. At length he arrived at the monastery of Clair Marais, near St. Omer: he was there joined by Herbert de Bosham, who had been left behind to collect what money he could at Canterbury: he brought but 100 marks and some plate. While he was in this part of Flanders the Justiciary, Richard de Luci, passed through the town on his way to England. He tried in vain to persuade the archbishop to return with him: Becket suspected his friendly overtures, or had resolutely determined not to put himself again in the King's power.

In the first access of indignation at Becket's flight the King had sent orders for strict watch to be kept in the ports of the kingdom, especially Dover. The next measure was to preoccupy the minds of the Count of

Flanders, the King of France, and the Pope against his fugitive subject. Henry could not but foresee how formidable an ally the exile might become to his rivals and enemies, how dangerous to his extensive but ill-consolidated foreign dominions. He might know that Becket would act and be received as an independent potentate. The rank of his ambassadors implied the importance of their mission to France. They were the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Exeter, Chichester, and Worcester, the Earl of Arundel, and three other distinguished nobles. The same day that Becket passed to Gravelines, they crossed from Dover to Calais.¹

The Earl of Flanders, though with some cause of hostility to Becket, had offered him a refuge ;
Becket in exile. yet perhaps was not distinctly informed or would not know that the exile was in his dominions.² He received the King's envoys with civility. The King of France was at Compiègne. The strongest passions in the feeble mind of Louis VII. were jealousy of Henry of England, and a servile bigotry to the Church, to which he seemed determined to compensate for the hostility and disobedience of his youth. Against Henry, personally, there were old causes of hatred rankling in his heart, not the less deep because they could not

¹ Foliot and the King's envoys crossed the same day. It is rather amusing that, though Becket crossed the same day in an open boat, and, as is incautiously betrayed by his friends, suffered much from the rough sea, the weather is described as in his case almost miraculously favorable, in the other as miraculously tempestuous. So that while Becket calmly glided over, Foliot in despair of his life threw off his cowl and cope.

² Compare, however, Roger of Pontigny. By his account, the Count of Flanders, a relative and partisan of Henry ("consanguineus et qui partes ejus fovebat"), would have arrested him. He escaped over the border by a trick. — Roger de Pontigny, p. 148.

be avowed. Henry of England was now the husband of Eleanor, who, after some years of marriage, had contemptuously divorced the King of France as a monk rather than a husband, had thrown herself in-^{From 1152} to the arms of Henry and carried with her a^{to 1164.} dowry as large as half the kingdom of France. There had since been years either of fierce war, treacherous negotiations, or jealous and armed peace, between the rival sovereigns.

Louis had watched, and received regular accounts of the proceedings in England; his admiration of Becket for his lofty churchmanship and daring opposition to Henry was at its height, scarcely disguised. He had already in secret offered to receive Becket, not as a fugitive, but as the sharer in his kingdom. The ambassadors appeared before Louis and presented a letter urging the King of France not to admit within his dominions the traitor Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury. "Late Archbishop! and who has presumed to depose him? I am a king, like my brother^{Louis of} of England; I should not dare to depose the^{France.} meanest of my clergy. Is this the King's gratitude for the services of his Chancellor, to banish him from France, as he has done from England?"¹ Louis wrote a strong letter to the Pope, recommending to his favor the cause of Becket as his own.

The ambassadors passed onward to Sens, where resided the Pope Alexander III., himself an^{Ambassadors} exile, and opposing his spiritual power to the^{at Sens.} highest temporal authority, that of the Emperor and his subservient Antipope. Alexander was in a position of extraordinary difficulty: on the one side were grati-

¹ Giles, iv. 253; Bouquet, p. 217.

tude to King Henry for his firm support, and the fear of estranging so powerful a sovereign, on whose unrivalled wealth he reckoned as the main strength of his cause; on the other, the dread of offending the King of France, also his faithful partisan, in whose dominions he was a refugee, and the duty, the interest, the strong inclination to maintain every privilege of the hierarchy. To Henry Alexander almost owed his pontificate. His first and most faithful adherents had been Theobald the primate, the English Church, and Henry King of England; and when the weak Louis had entered into dangerous negotiations at Lannes with the Emperor; when at Dijon he had almost placed himself in the power of Frederick, and his voluntary or enforced defection had filled Alexander with dread, the advance of Henry of England with a powerful force to the neighborhood rescued the French king from his perilous position.¹ And now, though Victor the Antipope was dead, a successor, Guido of Crema, had been set up by the imperial party, and Frederick would lose no opportunity of gaining, if any serious quarrel should alienate him from Alexander, a monarch of such surpassing power. An envoy from England, John Cummin, was even now at the imperial court.²

Becket's messengers, before the reception of Henry's ambassadors by Pope Alexander, had been admitted to a private interview. The account of Becket's "fight with beasts" at Northampton, and a skilful parallel with St. Paul, had melted the heart of the Pontiff, as he no doubt thought himself suffering like persecutions, to a flood of tears. How in truth could a Pope

¹ See back, page 281.

² *Epist. Nuntii*; Giles, iv. 254; Bouquet, p. 217.

venture to abandon such a champion of what were called the liberties of the church? He had, in fact, throughout been in secret correspondence with Becket. Whenever letters could escape the jealous watchfulness of the King, they had passed between England and Sens.¹

The ambassadors of Henry were received in state in the open consistory. Foliot of London began The King's ambassadors at Sens with his usual ability; his warmth at length betrayed him into the Scriptural citation, — “The wicked fleeth when no man pursueth.” “Forbear,” said the Pope. “I will forbear him,” answered Foliot. “It is for thine own sake, not for his, that I bid thee forbear.” The Pope’s severe manner silenced the Bishop of London. Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, who had overweening confidence in his own eloquence, began a long harangue: but at a fatal blunder in his Latin, the whole Italian court burst into laughter.² The discomfited orator tried in vain to proceed. The Archbishop of York spoke with prudent brevity. The Count of Arundel, more cautious or less learned, used his native Norman. His speech was mild, grave, and conciliatory, and therefore the most embarrassing to the Pontiff. Alexander consented to send his cardinal

¹ Becket writes from England to the Pope: “Quod petimus, summo silentio petimus occultari. Nilul enim nobis tutum est, quum omnia ferè referuntur ad regem, quæ nobis in conclavi vel in aurem dicuntur.” There is a significant clause at the end of this letter, which implies that the emissaries of the Church did not confine themselves to Church affairs: “De Wallensibus et Oweno, qui se principem nominat, *providentis*, quia Dominus Rex super hoc maximè motus est et indignatus.” The Welsh were in arms against the King: this borders on high treason. — Apud Giles. iii. 1, Bouquet, 221.

² The word “oportuebat” was too bad for monkish, or rather for Roman, ears.

legates to England; but neither the arguments of Foliot, nor those of Arundel, who now rose to something like a menace of recourse to the Antipope, would induce him to invest them with full power. The Pope would intrust to none but to himself the prerogative of final judgment. Alexander mistrusted the venality of his cardinals, and Henry's subsequent dealing with some of them justified his mistrust.¹ He was himself inflexible to tempting offers. The envoys privately proposed to extend the payment of Peter's Pence to almost all classes, and to secure the tax in perpetuity to the see of Rome. The ambassadors retreated in haste; their commission had been limited to a few days. The bishops, so strong was the popular feeling in France for Becket, had entered Sens as retainers of the Earl of Arundel: they received intimation that certain lawless knights in the neighborhood had determined to waylay and plunder these enemies of the Church, and of the saintly Becket.

Far different was the progress of the exiled primate. From St. Bertin he was escorted by the abbot, and by the Bishop of Terouenne. He entered France; he was met, as he approached Soissons, by the King's brothers, the Archbishop of Rheims, and a long train of bishops, abbots, and dignitaries of the church; he entered Soissons at the head of 300 horsemen. Becket at Sens. The interview of Louis with Becket raised his admiration into passion. As the envoys of Henry passed on one side of the river, they saw the pomp in which the ally of the King of France, rather than the

¹ According to Roger of Pontigny, there were some of them "*qui acceptâ a rege pecuniâ partes ejus fovebant*," particularly William of Pavia. — p. 153.

exile from England, was approaching Sens. The cardinals, whether from prudence, jealousy, or other motives, were cool in their reception of Becket. The Pope at once granted the honor of a public audience; he placed Becket on his right hand, and would not allow him to rise to speak. Becket, after a skillful account of his hard usage, spread out the parchment which contained the Constitutions of Clarendon. They were read; the whole Consistory exclaimed against the violation of ecclesiastical privileges. On further examination the Pope acknowledged that six of them were less evil than the rest; on the remaining ten he pronounced his unqualified condemnation. He rebuked the weakness of Becket in swearing to these articles, it is said, with the severity of a father, the tenderness of a mother.¹ He consoled him with the assurance that he had atoned by his sufferings and his patience for his brief infirmity. Becket pursued his advantage. The next day, by what might seem to some trustful magnanimity, to others, a skillful mode of getting rid of certain objections which had been raised concerning his election, he tendered the resignation of his archiepiscopate to the Pope. Some of the more politic, it was said, more venal cardinals, entreated the Pontiff to put an end at once to this dangerous quarrel by accepting the surrender.² But the Pontiff (his own judgment being supported among others by the Cardinal Hyacinth) restored to him the archiepiscopal ring, thus ratifying his primacy. He assured Becket of his protection, and committed him to the hospitable care of

¹ Herbert de Bosham.

² *Alani Vita* (p. 362); and *Alan's Life* rests mainly on the authority of John of Salisbury. Herbert de Bosham suppresses this.

the Abbot of Pontigny, a monastery about twelve leagues from Sens. "So long have you lived in ease and opulence, now learn the lessons of poverty from the poor."¹ Yet Alexander thought it prudent to inhibit any proceedings of Becket against the King till the following Easter.

Becket's emissaries had been present during the interview of Henry's ambassadors with the Pope. Henry, no doubt, received speedy intelligence of these proceedings with Becket. He was at Marlborough after a disastrous campaign in Wales.² He issued immediate orders to seize the revenues of the Archbishop, and promulgated a mandate to the bishops to sequester the estates of all the clergy who had followed him to France. He forbade public prayers for the Primate. In the exasperated state, especially of the monkish mind, prayers for Becket would easily slide into anathemas against the king. The payment of Peter's Pence³ to the Pope was suspended. All correspondence with Becket was forbid-

Effect on
King Henry.

Wrath of
Henry.

¹ The Abbot of Pontigny was an ardent admirer of Becket. See letter of the Bishop of Poitiers, Bouquet, p. 214. Prayers were offered up throughout the struggle with Henry for Becket's success at Pontigny, Citeaux, and Clairvaux. — Giles, iv. 255.

² Compare Lingard. Becket on this news exclaimed, as is said, "His wise men are become fools; the Lord hath sent among them a spirit of giddiness; they have made England to reel to and fro like a drunken man." — Vol. iii. p. 227. No doubt, he would have it supposed God's vengeance for his own wrongs.

³ There are in Foliot's letters many curious circumstances about the collection and transmission of Peter's Pence. In Alexander's present state, notwithstanding the amity of the King of France, this source of revenue was no doubt important. — Epist. 149, 172, &c. Alexander wrote from Clermont to Foliot (June 8, 1165) to collect the tax, to do all in his power for the recall of Becket: to Henry, reprobating the Constitutions; to Becket, urging prudence and circumspection. This was later. The Pope was then on his way to Italy, where he might need Henry's gold.

den. But the resentment of Henry was not satisfied. He passed a sentence of banishment, and ordered at once to be driven from the kingdom all the primate's kinsmen, dependents, and friends. Four hundred persons, it is said, of both sexes, of every age, even infants at the breast were included (and it was the depth of winter) in this relentless edict. Every adult was to take an oath to proceed immediately to Becket, in order that his eyes might be shocked, and his heart wrung by the miseries which he had brought on his family and his friends. This order was as inhumanly executed, as inhumanly enacted.¹ It was intrusted to Randolph de Broc, a fierce soldier, the bitterest of Becket's personal enemies. It was as impolitic as cruel. The monasteries and convents of Flanders and of France were thrown open to the exiles with generous hospitality. Throughout both these countries was spread a multitude of persons appealing to the pity, to the indignation of all orders of the people, and so deepening the universal hatred of Henry. The enemy of the Church was self-convicted of equal enmity to all Christianity of heart.

In his seclusion at Pontigny Becket seemed determined to compensate by the sternest monastic discipline for that deficiency which had been Becket at Pontigny. alleged on his election to the archbishopric. He put on the coarse Cistercian dress. He lived on the hard and scanty Cistercian diet. Outwardly he still maintained something of his old magnificence and the splendor of his station. His establishment of horses and retainers was so costly, that his sober friend, John of Salisbury, remonstrated against the profuse expendi

¹ Becket, Epist. 4, p. 7

ture. Richer viands were indeed served on a table apart, ostensibly for Becket; but while he himself was content with the pulse and gruel of the monks, those meats and game were given away to the beggars. His devotions were long and secret, broken with perpetual groans. At night he rose from the bed strewn with rich coverings, as beseeming an archbishop, and summoned his chaplain to the work of flagellation. Not satisfied with this, he tore his flesh with his nails, and lay on the cold floor, with a stone for his pillow. His health suffered; wild dreams, so reports one of his attendants, haunted his broken slumbers, of cardinals plucking out his eyes, fierce assassins cleaving his tattered crown.¹ His studies were neither suited to calm his mind, nor to abase his hierarchical haughtiness. He devoted his time to the canon law, of which the False Decretals now formed an integral part: sacerdotal fraud justifying the loftiest sacerdotal presumption. John of Salisbury again interposed with friendly remonstrance. He urged him to withdraw from these undevotional inquiries; he recommended to him the works of a Pope of a different character, the *Morals of Gregory the Great*. He exhorted him to confer with holy men on books of spiritual improvement.

King Henry in the mean time took a loftier and more menacing tone towards the Pope. "It is Negotiations with the Emperor. an unheard-of thing that the court of Rome should support traitors against my sovereign authority; I have not deserved such treatment.² I am still more indignant that the justice is denied to me which is granted to the meanest clerk." In his wrath he made

¹ Edw. Grim.

² Bouquet, xvi. 256.

overtures to Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, the maker, he might be called, of two Antipopes, and the minister of the Emperor, declaring that he had long sought an opportunity of falling off from Alexander, and his perfidious cardinals, who presumed to support against him the traitor Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Emperor met the advances of Henry with promptitude, which showed the importance he attached to the alliance. Reginald of Cologne was sent to England to propose a double alliance with the house of Swabia, of Frederick's son, and of Henry the Lion, with the two daughters of Henry Plantagenet. The Pope trembled at this threatened union between the houses of Swabia and England. At the great diet held at Wurtzburg, Frederick asserted the canonical election of Paschal III., Diet at Wurtzburg, A.D. 1165, Wurtsuntide. the new Antipope, and declared in the face of the empire and of all Christendom, that the powerful kingdom of England had now embraced his cause, and that the King of France stood alone in his support of Alexander.¹ In his public edict he declared to all Christendom that the oath of fidelity to Paschal, of denial of all future allegiance to Alexander, administered to all the great princes and prelates of the empire, had been taken by the ambassadors of King Henry, Richard of Ilchester, and John of Oxford.² Nor was this all. A

¹ The letters of John of Salisbury are full of allusions to the proceedings at Wurtzburg. — Bouquet, p. 524. John of Oxford is said to have denied the oath (p. 533); also Giles, iv. 264. He is from that time branded by John of Salisbury as an arch liar.

² John of Oxford was rewarded for this service by the deanery of Salisbury, vacant by the promotion of the dean to the bishopric of Bayeux. Joscelin, Bishop of Salisbury, notwithstanding the papal prohibition that

solemn oath of abjuration of Pope Alexander was enacted, and to some extent enforced; it was to be taken by every male over twelve years old throughout the realm.¹ The King's officers compelled this act of obedience to the King, in villages, in castles, in cities.

If the ambassadors of Henry at Wurtzburg had full powers to transfer the allegiance of the King to the Antipope; if they took the oath unconditionally, and with no reserve in case Alexander should abandon the cause of Becket; if this oath of abjuration in England was generally administered; it is clear that Henry soon changed, or wavered at least in his policy. The alliance between the two houses came to nothing. Yet even after this he addressed another letter to Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, declaring again his long cherished determination to abandon the cause of Alexander, the supporter of his enemy, the Archbishop of Canterbury. He demanded safe-conduct for an embassy to Rome, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London,

no election should take place in the absence of some of the canons, chose the safer course of obedience to the King's mandate. This act of Joscelyn was deeply resented by Becket. John of Oxford's usurpation of the deanery was one of the causes assigned for his excommunication at Vezelay. See also, on the loyal but somewhat unscrupulous proceedings of John of Oxford, the letter (hereafter referred to) of Nicolas de Monte Rotomagensi. It describes the attempt of John of Oxford to prepossess the Empress Matilda against Becket. It likewise betrays again the double-dealing of the Bishop of Lisieux, outwardly for the King, secretly a partisan and adviser of Becket. On the whole, it shows the moderation and good sense of the empress, who disapproved of some of the Constitutions, and especially of their being written, but speaks strongly of the abuses in the Church. Nicolas admires her skilfulness in defending her son. — Giles, iv. 187 Bouquet, 226.

¹ "Præcepit enim publicè et *compulit* per vicos, per castella, per civitates ab homine sene usque ad puerum duodenum beati Petri successorem Alexandrum abjurare." William of Canterbury alone of Becket's biographers (Giles, ii. p. 19) asserts this, but it is unanswerably confirmed by Becket's Letter 78, iii. p. 192.

John of Oxford. De Luci, the Justiciary, peremptorily to require the Pope to annul all the acts of Thomas, and to command the observance of the Customs.¹ The success of Alexander in Italy, aversion in England to the abjuration of Alexander, some unaccounted jealousy with the Emperor, irresolution in Henry, which was part of his impetuous character, may have wrought this change.

The monk and severe student of Pontigny found rest neither in his austerities nor his studies.² The causes of this enforced repose are manifest — the negotiations between Henry and the Emperor, the uncertainty of the success of the Pope on his return to Italy. It would have been perilous policy, either for him to risk, or for the Pope not to inhibit any rash measure.

In the second year of his seclusion, when he found that the King's heart was still hardened, the fire, not, we are assured by his followers, of resentment, but of parental love, not zeal for vengeance but for justice, burned within his soul. Henry was at this time in France. Three times the exile cited his sovereign with the tone of a superior to submit to his censure. Becket had communicated his design to his followers: — “Let us act as the Lord commanded his steward:”³ “See, I have set thee over the nations,

Becket cites the King.

¹ The letter in Giles (vi. 279) is rather perplexing. It is placed by Bouquet, agreeing with Baronius, in 1166; by Von Raumer (*Geschichte der Hohenstauffen*, ii. p. 192) in 1165, before the Diet of Wurtzburg. This cannot be right, as the letter implies that Alexander was in Rome, where he arrived not before Nov. 1165. The embassy, though it seems that the Emperor granted the safe-conduct, did not take place, at least as regards some of the ambassadors.

² “Itaque per biennium ferme stetit.” So writes Roger of Pontigny. It is difficult to make out so long a time. — p. 154.

³ Herbert de Bosham. — p. 226.

and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to hew down, to build and to plant.' ”¹ All his hearers applauded his righteous resolution. In the first message the haughty meaning was veiled in the blindest words,² and sent by a Cistercian of gentle demeanor, named Urban.³ The King returned a short and bitter answer. The second time Becket wrote in severer language, but yet in the spirit, 'tis said, of compassion and leniency.⁴ The King deigned no reply. His third messenger was a tattered, barefoot friar. To him Becket, it might seem, with studied insult, not only intrusted his letter to the King, but authorized the friar to speak in his name. With such a messenger the message was not likely to lose in asperity. The King returned an answer even more contemptuous than the address.⁵

But this secret arraignment of the King did not content the unquiet prelate. He could now dare more, unrestrained, unrebuked. Pope Alexander had been received at Rome with open arms: at the commencement of the present year all seemed to favor his cause. The Emperor, detained by wars in Germany, was not prepared to cross the Alps. In the free cities of Italy, the anti-imperialist feeling, and the growing republicanism, gladly entered into close confederacy with a Pope at war with the Emperor. The Pontiff (secretly it should seem, it might be in defiance or in

¹ Jer. i. 10.

² “*Suavissimas literas, supplicationem solam, correptionem vero nullam vel modicam continentes.*” — De Bosham.

³ Urbane by disposition as by name. — Ibid.

⁴ Giles, iii. 365. Bouquet, p. 243.

⁵ “*Quin potius dura propinantes, dura pro duris, immo multo plus duriora prioribus, reportaverunt.*” — De Bosham.

revenge for Henry's threatened revolt and for the acts of his ambassadors at Wurtzburg¹) ventured to grant to Becket a legatine power over the King's English dominions, except the province of York. Though it was not in the power of Becket to enter those dominions, it armed him, as it was thought, with unquestionable authority over Henry and his subjects. At all events it annulled whatever restraint the Pope, by counsel or by mandate, had placed on the proceedings of Becket.² The Archbishop took his determination alone.³ As though to throw an awful mystery about his plan, he called his wise friends together, and consulted them on the propriety of resigning his see. With one voice they rejected the timid counsel. Yet though his most intimate followers were in ignorance of his designs, some intelligence of a meditated blow was betrayed to Henry. The King summoned an assembly of prelates at Chinon. The Bishops of Lisieux and Seez, whom the Archbishop of Rouen, Rotran, con-

¹ The Pope had written (Jan. 23) to the bishops of England not to presume to act without the consent of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. April 5, he forbade Roger of York and the other prelates to crown the King's son. May 3, he writes to Foliot and the bishops who had received benefices of the King to surrender them under pain of anathema; to Becket in favor of Joscelin, Bishop of Salisbury: he had annulled the grant of the deanery of Salisbury to John of Oxford. May 10, to the Archbishop of Rouen, denouncing the dealings of Henry with the Emperor and the Antipope. — Giles, iv. 10 a 80. Bouquet, 246.

² The inhibition given at Sens to proceed against the King, before the Easter of the following year (A.D. 1166), had now expired. Moreover he had a direct commission to proceed by Commination against those who forcibly withheld the property of the see of Canterbury. — Apud Giles, iv. 8. Bouquet, xvi. 844. At the same time the Pope urged great discretion as to the King's person. — Giles, iv. 12. Bouquet, 244.

³ At the same time Becket wrote to Foliot of London, commanding him under penalty of excommunication to transmit to him the sequestered revenues of Canterbury in his hands. — Foliot appealed to the Pope. — Foliot's Letter. Giles, vi. 5. Bouquet, 215.

sented to accompany as a mediator, were despatched to Pontigny, to anticipate by an appeal to the Pope, any sentence which might be pronounced by Becket. They did not find him there: he had already gone to Soissons, on the pretext of a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Drausus, a saint whose intercession rendered the warrior invincible in battle. Did Becket hope thus to secure victory in the great spiritual combat? One whole night he passed before the shrine of St. Drausus: another before that of Gregory the Great, the founder of the English Church, and of the see of Canterbury; a third before that of the Virgin, his especial patroness.

From thence he proceeded to the ancient and famous monastery of Vezelay.¹ The church of Vezelay, if the dismal decorations of the architecture are (which is doubtful) of that period, might seem designated for that fearful ceremony.² There, on the

Becket at
Vezelay.

¹ The curious History of the Monastery of Vezelay, by Hugh of Poitiers, (translated in Guizot, Collection des Mémoires), though it twice mentions Becket, stops just short of this excommunication, 1166. Vezelay boasted to be subject only to the See of Rome, to have been made by its founder part of the patrimony of St. Peter. This was one great distinction: the other was the unquestioned possession of the body of St. Mary Magdalene, "l'amie de Dieu." Vezelay had been in constant strife with the Bishop of Autun for its ecclesiastical, with the Count of Nevers for its territorial, independence; with the monastery of Clugny, as its rival. This is a document very instructive as to the life of the age.

² A modern traveller thus writes of the church of Vezelay: "On voit par le choix des sujets qui ont un sens, quel était l'esprit du temps et la manière d'interpréter la religion. Ce n'était pas par la douceur ou la persuasion qu'on voulait convertir, mais bien par la terreur. Les discours des prêtres pourraient se résumer en ce peu de mots: 'Croyez, ou sinon vous périrez misérablement, et vous serez éternellement tourmentés dans l'autre monde!' De leur côté, les artistes, gens religieux, ecclésiastiques même pour la plupart, donnaient une forme réelle aux sombres images que leur inspirait un zèle farouche. Je ne trouve à Vezelay aucun de ces sujets que les âmes tendres aimeraient à retracer, tels que le pardon accordé au

feast of the Ascension,¹ when the church was crowded with worshippers from all quarters, he ascended the pulpit, and, with the utmost solemnity, condemned and annulled the Constitutions of Clarendon, declared excommunicate all who observed or enforced their observance, all who had counselled, and all who had defended them; absolved all the bishops from the oaths which they had taken to maintain them. This sweeping anathema involved the whole kingdom. But he proceeded to excommunicate by name the most active and powerful adversaries: John of Oxford, for his dealings with the schismatic partisans of the Emperor and of the Antipope, and for his usurpation of the deanery of Salisbury; Richard of Ilchester Archdeacon of Poitiers, the colleague of John in his negotiations at Wurtzburg (thus the cause of Becket and Pope Alexander were indissolubly welded together); the great Justiciary, Richard de Luci, and John of Baliol, the authors of the Constitutions of Clarendon; Randolph de Broc, Hugo de Clare, and others, for their forcible usurpation of the estates of the see of Canterbury. He yet in his mercy spared the king (he had received in-

repentir la récompense du juste, etc.; mais, au contraire, je vois Samuel égorgeant Agag; des diables écartelant des damnés, ou les entraînant dans l'abîme; puis des animaux horribles, des monstres hideux, des têtes grimées exprimant ou les souffrances des reprouvés, ou la joie des habitants de l'enfer. Qu'on se représente la dévotion des hommes élevés au milieu de ces images, et l'on s'étonnera moins des massacres des Albigeois." — Notes d'un Voyage dans le Midi de la France, par Prosper Mérimée, p. 43.

¹ Diceto gives the date Ascension Day, Herbert de Bosham St. Mary Magdalene's Day (July 22d). It should seem that De Bosham's memory failed him. See the letter of Nicolas de M. Rotomagensi, who speaks of the excommunication as past, and that Becket was expected to excommunicate *the King* on St. Mary Magdalene's day. This, if done at Vezelay (as it were, over the body of the Saint, on her sacred day), had been tenfold more awful.

telligence that Henry was dangerously ill), and in a lower tone, his voice, as it seemed, half choked with tears, he uttered his commination. The whole congregation, even his own intimate followers, were silent with amazement.

This sentence of excommunication Becket announced to the Pope, and to all the clergy of England. To the latter he said, "Who presumes to doubt that the priests of God are the fathers and masters of kings, princes, and all the faithful?" He commanded Gilbert, Bishop of London, and his other suffragans, to publish this edict throughout their dioceses. He did not confine himself to the bishops of England; the Norman prelates, the Archbishop of Rouen, were expressly warned to withdraw from all communion with the excommunicate.¹

The wrath of Henry drove him almost to madness. No one dared to name Becket in his presence.² Soon after, on the occasion of some discussion about the King of Scotland, he burst into a fit of passion, threw away his cap, ungirt his belt, stripped off his clothes, tore the silken coverlid from his bed, and crouched down on the straw, gnawing bits of it with his teeth.³ Proclamation was issued to guard the ports of England against the threatened interdict. Any one who should be apprehended as the bearer of such an instrument, if a regular, was to lose his feet; if a clerk, his eyes, and suffer more

Anger of the
King.

¹ See the curious letter of Nicolas de Monte Rotomagensi, Giles, iv., Bouquet, 250. This measure of Becket was imputed by the Archbishop of Rheims to pride or anger ("extollentiæ aut iræ"): it made an unfavorable impression on the Empress Matilda. — Ibid.

² Epist. Giles, iv. 185; Bouquet, 258.

³ Epist. Giles, iv. 260; Bouquet, 256.

shameful mutilation; a layman was to be hanged; a leper to be burned. A bishop who left the kingdom, for fear of the interdict, was to carry nothing with him but his staff. All exiles were to return on pain of losing their benefices. Priests who refused to chant the service were to be mutilated, and all rebels to forfeit their lands. An oath was to be administered by the sheriffs to all adults, that they would respect no ecclesiastical censure from the Archbishop.

A second time Henry's ungovernable passion betrayed him into a step which, instead of lowering, only placed his antagonist in a more formidable position. He determined to drive him from his retreat ^{Becket} at Pontigny. He sent word to the general of ^{driven from} Pontigny. the Cistercian order, that it was at their peril, if they harbored a traitor to his throne. The Cistercians possessed many rich abbeys in England; they dared not defy at once the King's resentment and rapacity. It was intimated to the Abbot of Pontigny, that he must dismiss his guest. The Abbot courteously communicated to Becket the danger incurred by the Order. He could not but withdraw; but instead now of lurking in a remote monastery, in some degree secluded from the public gaze, he was received in the archiepiscopal city of Sens; his honorable residence was prepared in a monastery close to the city; he lived in ostentatious communication with the Archbishop William, one of his most zealous partisans.¹

But the fury of haughtiness in Becket equalled the fury of resentment in the King: yet it was not without subtlety. Just before the scene at Vezelay, it has been said, the King had sent the Archbishop of Rouen and

¹ Herbert de Bosham, p. 232.

the Bishop of Lisieux to Pontigny, to lodge his appeal to the Pope. Becket, duly informed by his emissaries at the court, had taken care to be absent. He eluded likewise the personal service of the appeal of the English clergy. An active and violent correspondence ensued. The remonstrance, purporting to be from the Primate's suffragans and the whole clergy of England, was not without dignified calmness. With covert irony, indeed, they said that they had derived great consolation from the hope that, when abroad, he would cease to rebel against the King and the peace of the realm; that he would devote his days to study and prayer, and redeem his lost time by fasting, watching, and weeping; they reproached him with the former favors of the King, with the design of estranging the King from Pope Alexander; they asserted the readiness of the King to do full justice, and concluded by lodging an appeal until the Ascension-day of the following year.¹ Foliot was no doubt the author of this remonstrance, and between the Primate and the Bishop of London broke out a fierce warfare of letters. With Foliot Becket kept no terms. "You complain that the Bishop of Salisbury has been excommunicated, without citation, without hearing, without judgment. Remember the fate of Ucalegon. He trembled when his neighbor's house was on fire." To Foliot he asserted the preëminence, the supremacy, the divinity of the spiritual power without reserve. "Let not your liege lord be ashamed to defer to those to whom God himself defers, and calls them 'Gods.'"² Foliot replied

Controversy
with English
clergy.

¹ Epist. Giles, vi. 158; Bouquet, 259.

² "Non indignetur itaque Dominus noster deferre illis, quibus summus omnium deferre non dedignatur, Deos appellans eos sæpius in sacris literis.

with what may be received as the manifesto of his party, and as the manifesto of a party to be received with some mistrust, yet singularly curious, as showing the tone of defence taken by the opponents of the Primate among the English clergy.¹

The address of the English prelates to Pope Alexander was more moderate, and drawn with great ability. It asserted the justice, the obedience to the Church, the great virtue and (a bold assertion!) the conjugal fidelity of the King. The King had at once obeyed the citation of the Bishops of London and Salisbury, concerning some encroachments on the Church condemned by the Pope. The sole design of Henry had been to promote good morals, and to maintain the peace of the realm. That peace had been restored. All resentments had died away, when Becket fiercely recommenced the strife; in sad and terrible letters had threatened the King with excommunication, the realm with interdict. He had suspended the Bishop of Salisbury without trial. "This was the whole of the cruelty, perversity, malignity of the King against the Church, declaimed on and bruited abroad throughout the world."²

The indefatigable John of Oxford was in Rome, perhaps the bearer of this address. Becket John of Oxford at Rome. wrote to the Pope, insisting on all the cruelties of the King: he calls him a malignant tyrant,

Sic enim dixit, 'Ego dixit, Dii estis,' et 'Constitui te Deum Pharaonis,' et 'Deis non detrahere.'" — *Epist. Giles, iii. p. 287; Bouquet, 261.*

¹ Foliot took the precaution of paying into the exchequer all that he had received from the sequestered property of the see of Canterbury. — *Giles, v. p. 265. Lyttelton in Appendice.*

² "*Hæc est Domini regis toto orbe declamata crudelitas, hæc ab eo persecutio, hæc operum ejus perversorum rumusculis undique divulgata malignitas.*" — *Giles, vi. 190; Bouquet, 265.*

one full of all malice. He dwelt especially on the imprisonment of one of his chaplains, for which violation of the sacred person of a clerk, the King was *ipso facto* excommunicate. "Christ was crucified anew in Becket."¹ He complained of the presumption of Foliot, who had usurped the power of primate;² warned the Pope against the wiles of John of Oxford; deprecated the legatine mission, of which he had already heard a rumor, of William of Pavia. And all these letters, so unsparing to the King, or copies of them, probably bought out of the Roman chancery, were regularly transmitted to the King.

John of Oxford began his mission at Rome by swearing undauntedly, that nothing had been done at Wurtzburg against the power of the Church or the interests of Pope Alexander.³ He surrendered his deanery of Salisbury into the hands of the Pope, and received it back again.⁴ John of Oxford was armed

¹ Giles, iii. 6; Bouquet, 266. Compare letter of Bishop Elect of Chartres. — Giles, vi. 211; Bouquet, 269.

² Foliot obtained letters either at this time or somewhat later from his own Chapter of St. Paul, from many of the greatest dignitaries of the English Church, the abbots of Westminster and Reading, and from some distinguished foreign ecclesiastics, in favor of himself, his piety, churchmanship, and impartiality.

³ The German accounts are unanimous about the proceedings at Wurtzburg and the oath of the English ambassadors. See the account in Von Raumer (*loc. cit.*), especially of the conduct of Reginald of Cologne, and the authorities. John of Oxford is henceforth called, in John of Salisbury's letters, jurator. Becket repeatedly charges him with perjury, — Giles, iii. p. 129 and 351; Bouquet, 280. Becket there says that John of Oxford had given up part of the "customs." He begs John of Poitiers to let the King know this. See the very curious answer of John of Poitiers. — Giles, vi. 251; Bouquet, 280. It appears that as all Becket's letters to the Pope were copied and transmitted from Rome to Henry, so John of Poitiers, outwardly the King's loyal subject, is the secret spy of Becket. He speaks of those in England who thirst after Becket's blood.

⁴ The Pope acknowledges that this was extorted from him by fear of

with more powerful weapons than perjury or submission, and the times now favored the use of these more irresistible arms. The Emperor Frederick was levying, if he had not already set in motion, that mighty army which swept, during the next year, through Italy, made him master of Rome, and witnessed his coronation and the enthronement of the Antipope.¹ Henry had now, notwithstanding his suspicious — more than suspicious — dealings with the Emperor, returned to his allegiance to Alexander. Vast sums of English money were from this time expended in strengthening the cause of the Pope. The Guelfic cities of Italy received them with greedy hands. By the gold of the King of England, and of the King of Sicily, the Frangipani and the family of Peter Leonis were retained in their fidelity to the Pope. Becket, on the other hand, had powerful friends in Rome, especially the Cardinal Hyacinth, to whom he writes, that Henry had boasted that in Rome everything was venal. It was, however, not till a second embassy arrived, consisting Dec. 1166. of John Cummin and Ralph of Tamworth, that Alexander made his great concession, the sign that he was not yet extricated from his distress. He appointed William of Pavia, and Otho, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, his legates in France, to decide the cause.² Meantime all Becket's acts were suspended by the papal authority. At the same time the Pope wrote to Becket,

Henry, and makes an awkward apology to Becket. — Giles, iv. 18; Bouquet, 309.

¹ He was crowned in Rome August 1. Compare next chapter — Sismondi, *Républiques Italiennes*, ii. ch. x.; Von Raumer, ii. p. 209, &c.

² Giles, iii. 128; Bouquet, 272. Compare letters to Cardinals Boso and Henry. — Giles, iii. 103, 113; Bouquet, 174. Letter to Henry announcing the appointment, December 20.

entreating him at this perilous time of the Church to make all possible concessions, and to dissemble, if necessary, for the present.¹

If John of Oxford boasted prematurely of his triumph (on his return to England he took ostentatious possession of his deanery of Salisbury),² and predicted the utter ruin of Becket, his friends, especially the King of France,³ were in utter dismay at this change in the papal policy. John, as Becket had heard (and his emissaries were everywhere), on his landing in England, had met the Bishop of Hereford (one of the wavering bishops), prepared to cross the sea in obedience to Becket's citation. To him, after some delay, John had exhibited letters of the Pope, which sent him back to his diocese. On the sight of these same letters, the Bishop of London had exclaimed in the fulness of his joy, "Then our Thomas is no longer archbishop!" "If this be true," adds Becket, "the Pope has given a death-blow to the Church."⁴ To the Archbishop of Mentz, for in the empire he had his ardent admirers, he poured forth all the bitterness of his soul.⁵ Of the two cardinals he writes, "The one is weak and versatile, the other treacherous and crafty." He looked to their arrival with indignant apprehension. They

¹ 'Si non omnia secundum beneplacitum succedant, ad præsens dissimulet.' — Giles, vi. 15; Bouquet, 277.

² See the curious letter of Master Lombard, Becket's instructor in the canon law, who boldly remonstrates with the Pope. He asserts that Henry was so frightened at the menace of excommunication, his subjects, even the bishops, at that of his interdict, that they were in despair. Their only hope was in the death or some great disaster of the Pope. — Giles, iv. 208; Bouquet, 282.

³ See Letters of Louis; Giles, iv. 308; Bouquet, 287.

⁴ "Strangulavit," a favorite word. — Giles, iii. 214; Bouquet, 284.

⁵ Giles, iii. 235; Bouquet, 285.

are open to bribes, and may be perverted to any injustice.¹

John of Oxford had proclaimed that the cardinals, William of Pavia, and Otho, were invested in full powers to pass judgment between the King and the Primate.² But whether John of Oxford had mistaken or exaggerated their powers, or the Pope (no improbable case, considering the change of affairs in Italy) had thought fit afterwards to modify or retract them, they came rather as mediators than judges, with orders to reconcile the contending parties, rather than to decide on their cause. The cardinals did not arrive in France till the autumn of the year.³ Even before their arrival, first rumors, then more certain intelligence had been propagated throughout Christendom of the terrible disaster which had befallen the Emperor. Barbarossa's career of vengeance and conquest had been
A.D. 1167.
Flight of
Frederick
cut short. The Pope a prisoner, a fugitive, was unexpectedly released, restored to power, if not to

¹ Compare John of Salisbury, p. 539. "Scripsit autem rex Domino *Coloniensi*, Henricum Pisanum et Willelmum Papiensem in Franciam venturos ad novas exactiones faciendas, ut undique conradant et contrahant, unde Papa Alexander in urbe sustentetur: alter, ut nostis, levis est et mutabilis, alter dolosus et fraudulentus, uterque cupidus et avarus: et ideo de facili munera cœnabunt eos et ad omnem injustitiam incurvabunt. Audito eorum detestando adventu formidare capi præsentiam eorum causæ vestræ multum nocituram; et ne vestro et vestrorum sanguine gratiam Regis Angliæ redimere non erubescant." He refers with great joy to the insurrection of the Saxons against the Emperor. He says elsewhere of Henry of Pisa, "Vir bonæ opinionis est, sed Romanus et Cardinalis." — Epist. cc. ii.

² The English bishops declare to the Pope himself that they had received this concession, *scripto formatum*, from the Pope, and that the King was furious at what he thought a deception. — Giles, vi. 194; Bouquet, 304.

³ The Pope wrote to the legates to soothe Becket and the King of France; he accuses John of Oxford of spreading false reports about the extent of their commission; John Cummin of betraying his letters to the Antipope. — Giles, vi. 54.

the possession of Rome.¹ The climate of Rome, as usual, but in a far more fearful manner, had resented the invasion of the city by the German army. A pestilence had broken out, which in less than a month made such havoc among the soldiers, that they could scarcely find room to bury the dead. The fever seemed to choose its victims among the higher clergy, the partisans of the Antipope; of the princes and nobles, the chief victims were the younger Duke Guelf, Duke Frederick of Swabia, and some others; of the bishops, those of Prague, Ratisbon, Augsburg, Spire, Verdun, Liege, Zeitz; and the arch-rebel himself, the antipope-maker, Reginald of Cologne.² Throughout Europe the clergy on the side of Alexander raised a cry of awful exultation; it was God manifestly avenging himself on the enemies of the Church; the new Sennacherib (so he is called by Becket) had been smitten in his pride; and the example of this chastisement of Frederick was a command to the Church to resist to the last all rebels against her power, to put forth her spiritual arms, which God would as assuredly support by the same or more signal wonders. The defeat of Frederick was an admonition to the Pope to lay bare the sword of Peter, and smite on all sides.³

¹ So completely does Becket's fortune follow that of the Pope, that on June 17 Alexander writes to permit Roger of York to crown the King's son; no sooner is he safe in Benevento, August 22 (perhaps the fever had begun), than he writes to his legates to confirm the excommunications of Becket, which he had suspended.

² Muratori, sub ann. 1167; Von Raumer, ii. 210. On the 1st of August Frederick was crowned; September 4, he is at the Pass of Pontremoli, in full retreat, or rather flight.

³ In a curious passage in a letter written by Herbert de Bosham in the name of Becket, Frederick's defeat is compared to Henry's disgraceful campaign in Wales. "My enemy," says Becket "in the abundance of his

There can be no doubt that Becket so interpreted what he deemed a sign from heaven. But ^{Becket} even before the disaster was certainly known ^{against the legates.} he had determined to show no submission to a judge so partial and so corrupt as William of Pavia.¹ That cardinal had urged the Pope at Sens to accept Becket's resignation of his see. Becket would not deign to disguise his contempt. He wrote a letter so full of violence that John of Salisbury,² to whom it was submitted, persuaded him to destroy it. A second was little milder; at length he was persuaded to take a more moderate tone. Yet even then he speaks of the "insolence of princes lifting up their horn." To Cardinal Otho, on the other hand, his language borders on adulation.

The cardinal Legates travelled in slow state. They visited first Becket at Sens, afterwards King ^{Meeting} Henry at Rouen. At length a meeting was ^{near} ^{Gisors.} agreed on to be held on the borders of the French and English territory, between Gisors and Trie. The proud Becket was disturbed at being hastily summoned, when he was unable to muster a sufficient retinue of horsemen to meet the Italian cardinals. The two kings were there. Of Henry's prelates the Archbishop of Rouen alone was present at the first interview. Becket was charged with urging the King of France to war

valor, could not prevail against a breechless and ragged people ("exbraccatum et pannosum"). — Giles, viii. p. 268.

¹ "Credimus non esse juri consentaneum, nos ejus subire iudicium vel examen qui quærit sibi facere commercium de sanguine nostro, de pretio utinam non iniquitatis, quærit sibi nomen et gloriam." — D. Thom. Epist. Giles, iii. p. 15. The two legates are described as "plus avaritiæ quam justitiæ studiosi." — W. Cant. p. 21.

² Giles, iii. 157, and John of Salisbury's remarkable expostulatory letter upon Becket's violence. — Bouquet, p. 566.

against his master. On the following day the King of France said in the presence of the cardinals, that this

Octave of St. Martin.
Nov. 23. impeachment on Becket's loyalty was false. To all the persuasions, menaces, entreaties of

the cardinals¹ Becket declared that he would submit, "saving the honor of God, and of the Apostolic See, the liberty of the Church, the dignity of his person, and the property of the churches. As to the Customs he declared that he would rather bow his neck to the executioner than swear to observe them. He peremptorily demanded his own restoration at once to all the honors and possessions of the see." The third question was on the appeal of the bishops. Becket inveighed with bitterness on their treachery towards him, their servility to the King. "When the shepherds fled all Egypt returned to idolatry." Becket interpreted these "shepherds" as the clergy.² He compares them to the slaves in the old comedy; he declared that he would submit to no judgment on that point but that of the Pope himself.

The Cardinals proceeded to the King. They were received but coldly at Argences, not far from The Cardinals before the King. Caen, at a great meeting with the Norman and English prelates. The Bishop of London entered at length into the King's grievances and his own; Becket's debt to the King,³ his usurpations on the see of London. At the close Henry, in tears, entreated the cardinals to rid him of the troublesome churchman. William of Pavia wept, or seemed to

¹ Herbert de Bosham, p. 248; Epist. Giles, iii. 16; Bouquet, 296.

² Giles, iii. p. 21. Compare the whole letter.

³ Foliot rather profanely said, the primate seems to think that as sin is washed away in baptism, so debts are cancelled by promotion.

weep from sympathy. Otho, writes Becket's emissary, could hardly suppress his laughter. The English prelates afterwards at Le Mans solemnly renewed their appeal. Their appeal was accompanied with a letter, in which they complain that Becket would leave them exposed to the wrath of the King, from which wrath he himself had fled;¹ of false representations of the Customs, and disregard of all justice and of the sacred canons in suspending and anathematizing the clergy without hearing and without trial. William of Pavia gave notice of the appeal for the next St. Martin's Day (so a year was to elapse), with command to abstain from all excommunication and interdict of the kingdom till that day.² Both cardinals wrote strongly to the Pope in favor of the Bishop of London.³

At this suspension Becket wrote to the Pope in a tone of mingled grief and indignation.⁴ He described himself as the most wretched of men: applied the prophetic description of the Saviour's unequalled sorrow to himself. He inveighed against William of Pavia:⁵ he threw himself on the justice and compassion of the Pope. But this inhibition was confirmed by Dec. 29. the Pope himself, in answer to another embassy of

¹ "Ad mortem nos invitat et sanguinis effusionem, cum ipse mortem, quam nemo sibi dignabatur aut minabatur inferre, summo studio declinaverit et suum sanguinem illibatum conservando, ejus nec guttam effundi voluerit." — Giles, vi. 196. Bouquet, 304.

² Giles, vi. 148. Bouquet, 304.

³ Giles, vi. 135, 141. Bouquet, 306. William of Pavia recommended the translation of Becket to some other see.

⁴ Giles, iii. 28. Bouquet, 306.

⁵ One of his letters to William of Pavia begins with this fierce denunciation: "Non credebam me tibi venalem proponendum emptoribus, ut de sanguine meo compareres tibi compendium de pretio iniquitatis, faciens tibi nomen et gloriam." — Giles, iii. 153. Becket always represents his enemies as thirsting after his blood.

Henry, consisting of Clarembold, Prior Elect of St. Augustine's, the Archdeacon of Salisbury, and others.¹ This important favor was obtained through the interest of Cardinal John of Naples, who expresses his hope that the insolent Archbishop must at length see that he had no resource but in submission.

Becket wrote again and again to the Pope, bitterly complaining that the successive ambassadors of the King, John of Oxford, John Cummin, the Prior of St. Augustine's, returned from Rome each with larger concessions.² The Pope acknowledged that the concessions had been extorted from him. The ambassadors of Henry had threatened to leave the Papal Court, if their demands were not complied with, in open hostility. The Pope was still an exile in Benevento,³ and did not dare to reoccupy Rome. The Emperor, even after his discomfiture, was still formidable; he might collect another overwhelming Transalpine force. The subsidies of Henry to the Italian cities and to the Roman partisans of the Pope could not be spared. The Pontiff therefore wrote soothing letters to the King of France and to Becket. He insinuated that these concessions were but for a time. "For a time!" replied Becket in an answer full of fire and passion: "and in that time the Church of England falls utterly to ruin; the property of the Church and the poor is wrested from her. In that time prelaties and abbacies are confiscated to the King's use: in that time who will guard the flock when the wolf is in the

¹ Giles, iv. 128; vi. 133. Bouquet, 312, 313.

² Epist. Giles, ii. 24.

³ He was at Benevento, though with different degrees of power, from Aug. 22, 1167, to Feb. 24, 1170.

fold? This fatal dispensation will be a precedent for all ages. But for me and my fellow-exiles all authority of Rome had ceased forever in England. There had been no one who had maintained the Pope against kings and princes." His significant language involves the Pope himself in the general and unsparing charge of rapacity and venality with which he brands the court of Rome. "I shall have to give an account at the last day, where gold and silver are of no avail, nor gifts which blind the eyes even of the wise."¹ The same contemptuous allusions to that notorious venality transpire in a vehement letter addressed to the College of Cardinals, in which he urges that ^{To the Cardinals.} his cause is their own; that they are sanctioning a fatal and irretrievable example to temporal princes; that they are abrogating all obedience to the Church. "Your gold and silver will not deliver you in the day of the wrath of the Lord."² On the other hand, the King and the Queen of France wrote in a tone of indignant remonstrance that the Pope had abandoned the cause of the enemy of their enemy. More than one of the French prelates who wrote in the same strain declared that their King, in his resentment, had seriously thought of defection to the Antipope, and of a close connection with the Imperial family.³ Alexander determined to make another attempt at reconciliation; at least he should gain time, that precious source of hope to the embarrassed and irresolute. His mediators were the Prior of Montdieu and Bernard de Corilo, a

¹ Giles, iii. p. 55. Bouquet, 317. Read the whole letter beginning "Anima mea."

² Bouquet, 324.

³ Epist. Giles, iv. Bouquet 320.

monk of Grammont.¹ It was a fortunate time, for just at this juncture, peace and even amity seemed to be established between the Kings of France and England. Many of the great Norman and French prelates and nobles offered themselves as joint mediators with the commissioners of the Pope.

A vast assembly was convened on the day of the Epiphany in the plains near Montmirail, where in the presence of the two kings and the barons of each realm the reconciliation was to take place. Becket held a long conference with the mediators. He proposed, instead of the obnoxious phrase "saving my order," to substitute "saving the honor of God;"² the mediators of the treaty insisted on his throwing himself on the king's mercy absolutely and without reservation. With great reluctance Becket appeared at least to yield: his counsellors acquiesced in silence. With this distinct understanding the Kings of France and England met at Montmirail, and everything seemed prepared for the final settlement of this long and obstinate quarrel. The Kings awaited the approach of the Primate. But as he was on his way, De Bosham (who always assumes to himself the credit of suggesting Becket's most haughty proceedings) whispered in his ear (De Bosham himself asserts this) a solemn caution, lest he should act over again the fatal scene of weakness at Clarendon. Becket had

¹ Their instructions are dated May 25, 1168. See also the wavering letters to Becket and the King of France. — Giles, iv. p. 25, p. 111.

² "Sed quid? Nobis ita consilium suspendentibus et hæsitantibus quid agendum a pacis mediatoribus, multis et magnis viris, et præsertim qui inter ipsos a viris religiosis et aliis archipræsuli amicissimis et familiarissimis, adeo sicut et supra diximus, suasus, tractus et impulsus est, ut haberetur persuasus." — De Bosham, p. 268.

not time to answer De Bosham: he advanced to the King and threw himself at his feet. Henry raised him instantly from the ground. Becket, standing upright, began to solicit the clemency of the King. He declared his readiness to submit his whole cause to the judgment of the two Kings and of the assembled prelates and nobles. After a pause he added, "Saving the honor of God."¹

At this unexpected breach of his agreement the mediators, even the most ardent admirers of Becket, stood aghast. Henry, thinking himself duped, as ^{Treaty} well he might, broke out into one of his un-^{broken off.} governable fits of anger. He reproached the Archbishop with arrogance, obstinacy, and ingratitude. He so far forgot himself as to declare that Becket had displayed all his magnificence and prodigality as chancellor only to court popularity and to supplant his king in the affections of his people. Becket listened with patience, and appealed to the King of France as witness to his loyalty. Henry fiercely interrupted him. "Mark, Sire (he addressed the King of France), the infatuation and pride of the man: he pretends to have been banished, though he fled from his see. He would persuade you that he is maintaining the cause of the Church, and suffering for the sake of justice. I have always been willing, and am still willing, to grant that he should rule his Church with the same liberty as his predecessors, men not less holy than himself." Even the King of France seemed shocked at the conduct of

¹ "Sed mox adjecit, quod nec rex nec pacis mediatores, vel alii, vel etiam sui propriè æstimaverunt, ut adjiceret videlicet 'Salvo honore Dei.'" — De Bosham, p. 262. In his account to the Pope of this meeting, Becket suppresses his own tergiversation on this point. — Epist. Giles. iii. p. 43 Compare John of Salisbury (who was not present). Bouquet, 395.

Becket. The prelates and nobles, having in vain labored to bend the inflexible spirit of the Primate, retired in sullen dissatisfaction. He stood alone. Even John of Poitiers, his most ardent admirer, followed him to Etampes, and entreated him to yield. "And you, too," returned Becket, "will you strangle us, and give triumph to the malignity of our enemies?"¹

The King of England retired, followed by the Papal Legates, who, though they held letters of Commination from the Pope,² delayed to serve them on the King. Becket followed the King of France to Montmirail. He was received by Louis; and Becket put on so cheerful a countenance as to surprise all present. On his return to Sens, he explained to his followers that his cause was not only that of the Church, but of God.³ He passed among the acclamations of the populace, ignorant of his duplicity. "Behold the prelate who stood up even before two kings for the honor of God."

Becket may have had foresight, or even secret information of the hollowness of the peace between the two kings. Before many days, some acts of barbarous
War of France and England. cruelty by Henry against his rebellious subjects plunged the two nations again in hostility. The King of France and his prelates, feeling how nearly they had lost their powerful ally, began to admire what they called Becket's magnanimity as loudly as they had censured his obstinacy. The King

¹ "Ut quid nos et vos strangulatis?" — Epist. Giles, iii. 312.

² Throughout the Pope kept up his false game. He privately assured the King of France that he need not be alarmed if himself (Alexander) seemed to take part against the archbishop. The cause was safe in his bosom. See the curious letter of Matthew of Sens. — Epist. Giles, iv. p. 166.

³ "Nunc præter ecclesiæ causam, expressam ipsius etiam Dei causam agebamus." — De Bosham, 272.

visited him at Sens: one of the Papal commissioners, the Monk of Grammont, said privately to Herbert de Bosham, that he had rather his foot had been cut off than that Becket should have listened to his advice.¹

Becket now at once drew the sword and cast away the scabbard. "Cursed is he that refraineth his sword from blood." This Becket applied to the spiritual weapon. On Ascension Day he again solemnly excommunicated Gilbert Foliot Bishop of London, Joscelyn of Salisbury, the Archdeacon of Salisbury, Richard de Luci, Randolph de Broc, and many other of Henry's most faithful counsellors. He announced this excommunication to the Archbishop of Rouen,² and reminded him that whosoever presumed to communicate with any one of these outlaws of the Church by word, in meat or drink, or even by salutation, subjected himself thereby to the same excommunication. The appeal to the Pope he treated with sovereign contempt. He sternly inhibited Roger of Worcester, who had entreated permission to communicate with his brethren.³ "What fellowship is there between Christ and Belial?" He announced this act to the Pope, entreating, but with the tone of command, his approbation of the proceeding. An emissary of Becket had the boldness to enter St. Paul's Cathedral in London, to thrust the sentence into the hands of the officiating priest, and then to proclaim with a loud voice, "Know all men, that Gilbert Bishop of London is excommunicate by Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury and Legate of the Pope." He escaped with some

¹ De Bosham, 278.

² Giles, iii. 290, vi. 293. Bouquet, 346

³ Giles, iii. 322. Bouquet, 348.

difficulty from ill-usage by the people. Foliot immediately summoned his clergy; explained the illegality, injustice, nullity of an excommunication without citation, hearing, or trial, and renewed his appeal to the Pope. The Dean of St. Paul's and all the clergy, excepting the priests of certain monasteries, joined in the appeal. The Bishop of Exeter declined, nevertheless he gave to Foliot the kiss of peace.¹

King Henry was not without fear at this last desperate blow. He had not a single chaplain who had not been excommunicated, or was not virtually under ban for holding intercourse with persons under excommunication.² He continued his active intrigues, his subsidies in Italy. He bought the support of Milan, Pavia, Cremona, Parma, Bologna. The Frangipani, the family of Leo, the people of Rome, were still kept in allegiance to the Pope chiefly by his lavish payments.³ He made overtures to the King of Sicily, the Pope's ally, for a matrimonial alliance with his family: and finally, he urged the tempting offer to mediate a peace between the Emperor and the Pope. Reginald of Salisbury boasted that, if the Pope should die, Henry had the whole College of Cardinals in his pay, and could name his Pope.⁴

But no longer dependent on Henry's largesses to his partisans, Alexander's affairs wore a more prosperous aspect. He began, yet cautiously, to show his real bias.

¹ Epist. Giles, iv. 225.

² Fragm. Vit. Giles, i. p. 371.

³ "Et quod omnes Romanos datâ pecuniâ inducant ut faciant fidelitatem domino Papæ, dummodo in nostrâ dejectione regis Angliæ satisfaciatur voluntati" — Epist. ad Humbold. Card. Giles, iii. 123. Bouquet, 350. Compare Lambeth. on the effect of Italian affairs on the conduct of the Pope. — p. 106.

⁴ Epist. 188, p. 266.

He determined to appoint a new legatine commission, not now rapacious cardinals and avowed partisans of Henry. The Nuncios were Gratian, a hard and severe canon lawyer, not likely to swerve from the loftiest claims of the Decretals; and Vivian, a man of more pliant character, but as far as he was firm in any principle, disposed to high ecclesiastical views. At the same time he urged Becket to issue no sentences against the King or the King's followers; or if, as he hardly believed, he had already done so, to suspend their powers.

The terrors of the excommunication were not without their effect in England. Some of the Bishops began gradually to recede from the King's party, and to incline to that of the Primate. Hereford had already attempted to cross the sea. Henry of Winchester was in private correspondence with Becket: he had throughout secretly supplied him with money.¹ Becket skilfully labored to awaken his old spirit of opposition to the Crown. He reminded Winchester of his royal descent, that he was secure in his powerful connections; "the impious one would not dare to strike him, for fear lest his kindred should avenge his cause."² Norwich, Worcester, Chester, Chichester, more than wavered. This movement was strengthened by a false step of Foliot, which exposed all his former proceedings to the charge of irregular ambition. He began to declare publicly not only that he never swore canonical obedience to Becket, but to

¹ Fitz-Stephen, p. 271.

² "Domo vestra flagellum suspendit impius, ne quod promereret, propinquorum vestrorum ministerio veniat super eum." — Giles, iii. 338. Bouquet, 358.

assert the independence of the see of London and the right of the see of London to the primacy of England. Becket speaks of this as an act of spiritual parricide; Foliot was another Absalom.¹ He appealed to the pride and the fears of the Chapter of Canterbury: he exposed, and called on them to resist, these machinations of Foliot to degrade the archiepiscopal see. At the same time he warned all persons to abstain from communion with those who were under his ban; "for he had accurate information as to all who were guilty of that offence." Even in France this proceeding strengthened the sympathy with Becket. The Archbishop of Sens, the Bishops of Troyes, Paris, Noyon, Auxerre, Boulogne, wrote to the Pope to denounce this audacious impiety of the Bishop of London.

The first interview of the new Papal legates, Gratian and Vivian, with the King, is described with singular minuteness by a friend of Becket.² On the eve of St. Bartholomew's Day they arrived at Dampont. On their approach, Geoffry Ridel and Nigel Sackville stole out of the town. The King, as he came in from hunting, courteously stopped at the lodging of the Legates: as they were conversing the Prince rode up with a great blowing of horns from the chase, and presented a whole stag to the Legates. The next morning the King visited them, accompanied by the Bishops of Secz and of Rennes. Presently John of Oxford, Reginald of Salisbury, and the Archdeacon of Llandaff were admitted. The conference lasted the whole day, sometimes in amity, sometimes in strife. Just before sunset the King rushed out in wrath, swear-

Interview
of the new
Legates with
the King.
Aug. 23.

¹ Giles, iii. 201. Bouquet, 361.

² "Amici ad Thomam." — Giles, iv. 277. Bouquet, 370.

ing by the eyes of God that he would not submit to their terms. Gratian firmly replied, "Think not to threaten us; we come from a court which is accustomed to command Emperors and Kings." The King then summoned his barons to witness, together with his chaplains, what fair offers he had made. He departed somewhat pacified. The eighth day was appointed for the convention, at which the King and the Archbishop were again to meet in the presence of the Legates.

It was held at Bayeux. With the King appeared the Archbishops of Rouen and Bordeaux, the Aug. 31. Bishop of Le Mans, and all the Norman prelates. The second day arrived one English bishop — Worcester. John of Poitiers kept prudently away. The Legates presented the Pope's preceding letters in favor of Becket. The King, after stating his grievances,¹ said, "If for this man I do anything, on account of the Pope's entreaties, he ought to be very grateful." The next day at a place called Le Bar, the King requested the Legates to absolve his chaplains without any oath: on their refusal, the King mounted his horse, and swore that he would never listen to the Pope or any one else concerning the restoration of Becket. The prelates interceded; the Legates partially gave way. The King dismounted and renewed the conference. At length he consented to the return of Becket and all the exiles. He seemed delighted at this, and treated of other affairs. He returned again to the Legates, and demanded that they, or one of them, or at least some one commissioned by them, should cross over to

¹ Henry, it should be observed, waived all the demands which he had hitherto urged against Becket, for debts incurred during his chancellorship.

England to absolve all who had been excommunicated by the Primate. Gratian refused this with inflexible obstinacy. The King was again furious: "I care not an egg for you and your excommunications." He again mounted his horse, but at the earnest supplication of the prelates he returned once more. He demanded that they should write to the Pope to announce his pacific offers. The bishops explained to the King that the Legates had at last produced a positive mandate of the Pope, enjoining their absolute obedience to his Legates. The King replied, "I know that they will lay my realm under an interdict, but cannot I, who can take the strongest castle in a day, seize any ecclesiastic who shall presume to utter such an interdict?" Some concessions allayed his wrath, and he returned to his offers of reconciliation. Geoffry Ridel and Nigel Sackville were absolved on the condition of declaring, with their hands on the Gospels, that they would obey the commands of the Legates. The King still pressing the visit of one of the Legates to England, Vivian consented to take the journey. The bishops were ordered to draw up the treaty; but the King insisted on a clause "Saving the honor of his Crown." They adjourned to a future day at Caen. The Bishop of Lisieux, adds the writer, flattered the King; the Archbishop of Rouen was for God and the Pope.

Two conferences at Caen and at Rouen were equally inconclusive; the King insisted on the words, "saving the dignity of my Crown." Becket inquired if he might add, "saving the liberty of the Church."¹

The King threw all the blame of the final rupture

¹ Epist. Giles, iv. 216. Bouquet, 373.

on the Legates, who had agreed, he said, to this clause,¹ but through Becket's influence withdrew from their word.² He reminded the Pope that he had in his possession letters of his Holiness exempting him and his realm from all authority of the Primate till he should be received into the royal favor.³ "If," he adds, "the Pope refuses my demands, he must henceforth despair of my good-will, and look to other quarters to protect his realm and his honor." Both parties renewed their appeals, their intrigues in Rome: Becket's complaints of Rome's venality became louder.⁴

Becket began again to fulminate his excommunications. Before his departure Gratian signified to Geoffrey Ridel and Nigel Sackville that their absolution was conditional; if peace was not ratified by Michaelmas, they were still under the ban. Becket menaced some old, some new victims, the Dean of Salisbury, John Cummin, the Archdeacon of Llandaff, and others.⁵ But he now took a more decisive and terrible step. He wrote to the bishops of England,⁶ commanding them to lay the whole kingdom under interdict; all divine of-

¹ "Revocato consensu," writes the Bishop of Nevers, a moderate prelate, who regrets the obstinacy of the nuncios. — Giles, vi. 286. Bouquet, 377. Compare the letter of the clergy of Normandy to the Pope. — Giles, vi. 177. Bouquet, 377.

² Becket thought, or pretended to think, that under the "*dignitatibus*" lurked the "*consuetudinibus*." — Giles, iii. 299. Bouquet, 379.

³ "*Ceteras vestras recepimus, et ipsas adhuc penes nos habemus, in quibus terram nostram et personas regni a præfata Cantuariensis potestate eximebatis, donec ipse in gratiam nostram rediisset.*" — Epist. Giles, vi. 291. Bouquet, 374.

⁴ "*Nam quod mundus sentit, dolet, ingemiscit, nullus adeo iniquam causam ad ecclesiam Romanam defert, quin ibi spe lucri concepta ne dixerim odore sordium, adiutorem inveniat et patronum.*" — Epist. iii. 133. Bouquet, 382.

⁵ Giles, iii. 250; Bouquet, 387.

⁶ Giles, iii. 334; Bouquet, 388.

fices were to cease except baptism, penance, and the viaticum, unless before the Feast of the Purification Nov. 2, 1170. the King should have given full satisfaction for his contumacy to the Church. This was to be done with closed doors, the laity expelled from the ceremony, with no bell tolling, no dirge wailing; all church music was to cease. The act was speedily announced to the chapters of Chichester, Lincoln, and Bath. Of the Pope he demanded that he would treat the King's ambassadors, Reginald of Salisbury and Richard Barre, one as actually excommunicate, the other as contaminated by intercourse with the excommunicate.¹

The menace of the Interdict, with the fear that the Bishops of England, all but London and Salisbury, might be overawed into publishing it in their dioceses, threw Henry back into his usual irresolution. There were other alarming signs. Gratian had returned to Rome, accompanied by William, Archbishop of Sens, Becket's most faithful admirer. Rumors spread that William was to return invested in full legatine powers — William, not only Becket's friend, but the head of the French hierarchy. If the Interdict should be extended to his French dominions, and the Excommunication launched against his person, could he depend on the precarious fidelity of the Norman prelates? Differences had again arisen with the King of France.²

¹ Giles, iii. 42; Bouquet, 390. Reginald of Salisbury was an especial object of Becket's hate. He calls him one born in fornication ("fornicarium"), son of a priest. Reginald hated Becket with equal cordiality. Becket had betrayed him by a false promise of not injuring his father. "Quod utique ipsi non plus quam cani faceremus." — This letter contains Reginald's speech about Henry having the College of Cardinals in his pay. — Giles, iii. 225; Bouquet, 391.

² Becket writes to the Pope, January, 1170. "Nec vos oportet de cætero vereri, ne transeat ad schismaticos, quod sic eum Christus in manu famuli

Henry was seized with an access of devotion. He asked permission to offer his prayers at the shrines ^{Henry at Paris.} and at the Martyrs' Mount (Montmartre) at Paris. The pilgrimage would lead to an interview with the King of France, and offer an occasion of renewing the negotiations with Becket. Vivian was hastily summoned to turn back. His vanity ^{Nov. 1149.} was flattered by the hope of achieving that reconciliation which had failed with Gratian. He wrote to Becket requesting his presence. Becket, though he suspected Vivian, yet out of respect to the King of France, consented to approach as near as Château Corbeil. After the conference with the King of France, two petitions from Becket, in his usual tone of imperious humility, were presented to the King of England. The Primate condescended to entreat the favor of Henry, and the restoration of the church of Canterbury, in as ample a form as it was held before his exile. The second was more brief, but raised a new question of compensation for loss and damage during the archbishop's absence from his see.¹ Both parties ^{Negotiations renewed.} mistrusted each other; each watched the other's words with captious jealousy. Vivian, weary of those verbal chicaneries of the King, declared that he had never met with so mendacious a man in his life.² Vivian might have remembered his own retractations,

sui, regis Francorum subegit, ut ab obsequio ejus non possit amplius separari." — p. 48.

¹ Many difficult points arose. Did Becket demand not merely the actual possessions of the see, but all to which he laid claim? There were three estates held by William de Ros, Henry of Essex, and John the Marshall (the original object of dispute at Northampton?), which Becket specifically required and declared that he would not give up if exiled forever. — *Epist. Giles*, iii. 220; *Bouquet*, 400.

² *Epist. Giles*, iii. 262; *Bouquet*, 199.

still more those of Becket on former occasions. He withdrew from the negotiation ; and this conduct, with the refusal of a gift from Henry (a rare act of virtue), won him the approbation of Becket. But Becket himself was not yet without mistrust ; he had doubts whether Vivian's report to the Pope would be in the same spirit. "If it be not, he deserves the doom of the traitor Judas."

Henry at length agreed that on the question of compensation he would abide by the sentence of the court of the French King, the judgment of the Gallican Church, and of the University of Paris.¹ This made so favorable an impression that Becket could only evade it by declaring that he had rather come to an amicable agreement with the King than involve the affair in litigation.

At length all difficulties seemed yielding away, when Becket demanded the customary kiss of peace, as the pledge of reconciliation. Henry peremptorily refused ; he had sworn in his wrath never to grant this favor to Becket. He was inexorable ; and without this guarantee Becket would not trust the faith of the King. He was reminded, he said, by the case of the Count of Flanders, that even the kiss of peace did not secure a revolted subject, Robert de Silian, who, even after this sign of amity, had been seized and cast into a dungeon. Henry's conduct, if not the effect of sudden passion or ungovernable aversion, is inexplicable. Why did he seek this interview, which, if he was insincere in his desire for reconciliation, could afford but short delay ? and from such oaths he would hardly have refused, for any great purpose of his own,

Kiss of
peace.

¹ Epist. *ibid.* ; Radulph de Diceto.

to receive absolution.¹ On the other hand, it is quite clear that Becket reckoned on the legatine power of William of Sens and the terror of the English prelates, who had refused to attend a council in London to reject the Interdict. He had now full confidence that he could exact his own terms and humble the King under his feet.²

But the King was resolved to wage war to the utmost. Geoffry Ridel, Archdeacon of Canterbury, was sent to England with a royal King's proclamation. proclamation containing the following articles: — I. Whosoever shall bring into the realm any letter from the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury is guilty of high treason. II. Whosoever, whether bishop, clerk, or layman, shall observe the Interdict, shall be ejected from all his chattels, which are confiscate to the Crown. III. All clerks absent from England shall return before the feast of St. Hilary, on pain of forfeiture of all their revenues. IV. No appeal is to be made to the Pope or Archbishop of Canterbury under pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of all chattels. V. All laymen from beyond seas are to be searched, and if anything be found upon them contrary to the King's honor, they are to be imprisoned; the same with those who cross to the Continent. VI. If any clerk or monk shall land in England without passport from the King, or with anything contrary to his honor, he shall be thrown into prison. VII. No clerk or monk may cross the seas without the King's passport. The same rule applied to the clergy of Wales, who were to be expelled from

¹ According to Pope Alexander, Henry offered that his son should give the kiss of peace in his stead. — Giles. iv. 55.

² See his letter to his emissaries at Rome. — Giles, iii. 219; Bouquet, 401

all schools in England. Lastly, VIII. The sheriffs were to administer an oath to all freemen throughout England, in open court, that they would obey these royal mandates, thus abjuring, it is said, all obedience to Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury.¹ The bishops, however, declined the oath; some concealed themselves in their dioceses. Becket addressed a triumphant or gratulatory letter to his suffragans on their firmness. "We are now one, except that most hapless Judas, that rotten limb (Foliot of London), which is severed from us."² Another letter is addressed to the people of England, remonstrating on their impious abjuration of their pastor, and offering absolution to all who had sworn through compulsion and repented of their oath.³ The King and the Primate thus contested the realm of England.

But the Pope was not yet to be inflamed by Becket's passions, nor quite disposed to depart from his
 ● The Pope still dubious. temporizing policy. John of Oxford was at the court in Benevento with the Archdeacons of Rouen and Seez. From that court returned the Archdeacon of Llandaff and Robert de Barre with a commission to the Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers to make one more effort for the termination of the difficulties. On the one hand they were armed with powers, if the King did not accede to his own terms within forty days after his citation (he had offered a thousand marks as compensation for all losses), to pronounce an interdict against his continental dominions;

¹ Ricardus Dorubernensis apud Twysden. Lord Lyttelton has another copy, in his appendix; in that a ninth article forbade the payment of Peter's Pence to Rome; it was to be collected and brought into the exchequer

² Epist. Giles, iii. 195; Bouquet, 404.

³ Giles, iii. 192; Bouquet, 405.

on the other, Becket was exhorted to humble himself before the King; if Henry was inflexible and declined the Pope's offered absolution from his oath, to accept the kiss of peace from the King's son. The King was urged to abolish in due time the impious and obnoxious Customs. And to these prelates was likewise intrusted authority to absolve the refractory Bishops of London and Salisbury.¹ This, however, was not the only object of Henry's new embassy to the Pope. He had long determined on the coronation of his eldest son; it had been delayed for various reasons. He seized this opportunity of reviving a design which would be as well humiliating to Becket as also of great moment in case the person of the King should be struck by the thunder of excommunication. The coronation of the King of England was the undoubted prerogative of the Archbishops of Canterbury, which had never been invaded without sufficient cause, and Becket was the last man tamely to surrender so important a right of his see. John of Oxford was to exert every means (what those means were may be conjectured rather than proved) to obtain the papal permission for the Archbishop of York to officiate at that august ceremony.

The absolution of the Bishops of London and Salisbury was an astounding blow to Becket. He tried to impede it by calling in question the power of the archbishop to pronounce it without the presence of his colleague. The archbishop disregarded his remonstrance, and Becket's sentence was thus annulled by the authority of the Pope. Rumors at the same time began to spread that the Pope had granted to the Archbishop of York power to proceed to the coronation. Becket's

¹ Dated February 12, 1170.

fury burst all bounds. He wrote to the Cardinal Albert and to Gratian: "In the court of Rome, now as ever, Christ is crucified and Barabbas released. The miserable and blameless exiles are condemned, the sacrilegious, the homicides, the impenitent thieves are absolved, those whom Peter himself declares that in his own chair (the world protesting against it) he would have no power to absolve.¹ Henceforth I commit my cause to God — God alone can find a remedy. Let those appeal to Rome who triumph over the innocent and the godly, and return glorying in the ruin of the Church. For me I am ready to die." Becket's fellow-exiles addressed the Cardinal Albert, denouncing in vehement language the avarice of the court of Rome, by which they were brought to support the robbers of the Church. It is no longer King Henry alone who is guilty of this six years' persecution, but the Church of Rome.²

The coronation of the Prince by the Archbishop of York took place in the Abbey of Westminster on the 15th of June.³ The assent of the clergy was given

¹ Epist. Giles, iii. 96; Bouquet, 416; Giles, iii. 108; Bouquet, 419. "*Sed pro eâ mori parati sumus.*" He adds: "*Insurgant qui voluerint cardinales, arment non modo regem Angliæ, sed totum, si possent orbem in perniciem nostram . . . Utinam via Romana non gratis peremisset tot miseræ innocentes. Quis de cetero audebit illi regi resistere quem ecclesia Romana tot triumphis animavit, et armavit exemplo pernicioso manante ad posterum.*"

² "*Nec persuadebitur mundo, quod suasores isti Deum saperent; sed potius pecuniam, quam immoderato avaritiæ ardore sitiunt, olfecerunt.*" — Giles, iv. 291; Bouquet, 417.

³ Becket's depression at this event is dwelt upon in a letter of Peter of Blois to John of Salisbury. Peter travelled from Rome to Bologna with the Papal legates. From them he gathered that either Becket would soon be reconciled to the King or be removed to another patriarchate. — Epist. xxii. apud Giles, i. p. 84.

with that of the laity. The Archbishop of York produced a papal brief, authorizing him to perform the ceremony.¹ An inhibitory letter, if it reached England, only came into the King's hand, and was suppressed; no one, in fact (as the production of such papal letter, as well as Becket's protest to the archbishop and to the bishops collectively and severally, was by the royal proclamation high treason or at least a misdemeanor) would dare to produce them.

The estrangement seemed now complete, the reconciliation more remote than ever. The Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers, though urged to immediate action by Becket and even by the Pope, admitted delay after delay, first for the voyage of the King to England, and secondly for his return to Normandy. Becket seemed more and more desperate, the King more and more resolute. Even after the Coronation, it should seem, Becket wrote to Roger of York,² to Henry of Worcester, and even to Foliot of London, to publish the Interdict in their dioceses. The latter

¹ Dr. Lingard holds this letter, printed by Lord Lyttelton, and which he admits was produced, to have been a forgery. If it was, it was a most audacious one; and a most flagrant insult to the Pope, whom Henry was even now endeavoring to propitiate through the Lombard Republics and the Emperor of the East (see Giles, iv. 10). It is remarkable, too, that though the Pope declares that this coronation, contrary to his prohibition (Giles, iv. 30), is not to be taken as a precedent, he has no word of the forgery. Nor do I find any contemporary assertion of its spuriousness. Becket, indeed, in his account of the last interview with the King, only mentions the general permission granted by the Pope at an early period of the reign; and argues as if this were the only permission. Is it possible that a special permission to York to act was craftily interpolated into the general permission? But the trick may have been on the side of the Pope, now granting, now nullifying his own grants by inhibition. Bouquet is strong against Baronius (as on other points) upon Alexander's duplicity. — p. 434.

² Giles, iii. 229

was a virtual acknowledgment of the legality of his absolution, which in a long letter to the Bishop of Nevers he had contested :¹ but the Interdict still hung over the King and the realm ; the fidelity of the clergy was precarious.

The reconciliation at last was so sudden as to take the world by surprise. The clue to this is found in Fitz-Stephen. Some one had suggested by word or by writing to the King that the Primate would be less dangerous within than without the realm.² The hint flashed conviction on the King's mind. The two Kings had appointed an interview at Fretteville, between Chartres and Tours. The Archbishop of Sens prevailed on Becket to be, unsummoned, in the neighborhood. Some days after the King seemed persuaded by the Archbishops of Sens and Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers to hold a conference with Becket.³ As soon as they drew near the King rode up, uncovered his head, and saluted the Prelate with frank courtesy, and after a short conversation between the two and the Archbishop of Sens, the King withdrew apart with Becket. Their conference was so long as to try the patience of the spectators, so familiar that it might seem there had never been discord between them. Becket took a moderate tone ; by his own account he laid the faults of the King entirely on his evil counsellors. After a gentle admonition to the King on his sins, he urged him to make restitution to the see of Canterbury. He dwelt strongly on the late

Treaty of
Fretteville.

¹ Giles, iii. 302.

² "Dictum fuit aliquem dixisse vel scripsisse regi Anglorum de Archiepiscopo ut quid tenetur exclusus? melius tenebitur inclusus quam exclusus. Satisque dictum fuit intelligenti." — p. 272.

³ Giles, iv. 30; Bouquet, 436.

usurpation on the rights of the primacy, on the coronation of the King's son. Henry alleged the state of the kingdom and the necessity of the measure; he promised that as his son's queen, the daughter of the King of France, was also to be crowned, that ceremony should be performed by Becket, and that his son should again receive his crown from the hands of the Primate.

At the close of the interview Becket sprung from his horse and threw himself at the King's feet. The King leaped down, and holding his stirrup compelled the Primate to mount his horse again. In the most friendly terms he expressed his full reconciliation not only to Becket himself, but to the wondering and delighted multitude. There seemed an understanding on both sides to suppress all points which might lead to disagreement. The King did not dare (so Becket writes triumphantly to the Pope) to mutter one word about the Customs.¹ Becket was equally prudent, though he took care that his submission should be so vaguely worded as to be drawn into no dangerous concession on his part. He abstained, too, from all other perilous topics; he left undecided the amount of satisfaction to the church of Canterbury; and on July. these general terms he and the partners of his exile were formally received into the King's grace.

If the King was humiliated by this quiet and sudden reconciliation with the imperious prelate, to outward appearance at least he concealed his humiliation by his noble and kingly manner. If he submitted to

¹ "Nam de consuetudinibus quas tanta pervicaciâ vindicare consueverat nec mutire præsumpsit." Becket was as mute. The issue of the quarrel seems entirely changed. The Constitutions of Clarendon recede, the right of coronation occupies the chief place. — See the long letter, Giles, 65.

the spiritual reproof of the prelate, he condescended to receive into his favor his refractory subject. Each maintained prudent silence on all points in dispute. Henry received, but he also granted pardon. If his concession was really extorted by fear, not from policy, compassion for Becket's six years' exile might seem not without influence. If Henry did not allude to the Customs, he did not annul them; they were still the law of the land. The kiss of peace was eluded by a vague promise. Becket made a merit of not driving the King to perjury, but he skilfully avoided this trying test of the King's sincerity.

But Becket's revenge must be satisfied with other victims. If the worldly King could forget the rancor of this long animosity, it was not so easily appeased in the breast of the Christian Prelate. No doubt vengeance disguised itself to Becket's mind as the lofty and rightful assertion of spiritual authority. The opposing prelates must be at his feet, even under his feet. The first thought of his partisans was not his return to England with a generous amnesty of all wrongs, or a gentle reconciliation of the whole clergy, but the condign punishment of those who had so long been the counsellors of the King, and had so recently officiated in the coronation of his son.

The court of Rome did not refuse to enter into these views, to visit the offence of those disloyal bishops who had betrayed the interests and compromised the high principles of churchmen.¹ It was presumed that the King would not risk a peace so hardly gained for his

¹ Humbold Bishop of Ostia advised the confining the triumph to the depression of the Archbishop of York and the excommunication of the Bishops. — Giles, vi. 129; Bouquet, 443.

obsequious prelates. The lay adherents of the King, even the plunderers of Church property were spared, some ecclesiastics about his person, John of Oxford himself, escaped censure : but Pope Alexander sent the decree of suspension against the Archbishop- Dated Sept. 10. op of York, and renewed the excommunication of London and Salisbury, with whom were joined the Archdeacon of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester, as guilty of special violation of their allegiance to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of St. Asaph, and some others. Becket himself saw the policy of altogether separating the cause of the bishops from that of the King. He requested that some expressions relating to the King's excesses, and condemnatory of the bishops for swearing to the Customs, should be suppressed ; and the excommunication grounded entirely on their usurpation of the right of crowning the King.¹

About four months elapsed between the treaty of Fretteville and the return of Becket to England. They were occupied by these negotiations at Rome, Veroli, and Ferentino ; by discussions with the King, who was attacked during this period with a dangerous illness ; and by the mission of some of Becket's officers to resume the estates of the see. Becket had two Interview at Tours personal interviews with the King : the first was at Tours, where, as he was now in the King's dominions, he endeavored to obtain the kiss of peace. The Archbishop hoped to betray Henry into this favor during the celebration of the mass, in which it might

¹ "Licet ei (regi sc.) pepercitis, dissimulare non audetis excessus et crimina sacerdotum." This letter is a curious revelation of the arrogance and subtlety of Becket. — Giles. iii. 77.

seem only a part of the service.¹ Henry was on his guard, and ordered the mass for the dead, in which the benediction is not pronounced. The King had received Becket fairly; they parted not without ill-concealed estrangement. At the second meeting the King seemed more friendly; he went so far as to say, "Why resist my wishes? I would place everything in your hands." Becket, in his own words, bethought him of the tempter, "All these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

The King had written to his son in England that the see of Canterbury should be restored to Becket, as it was three months before his exile. But there were two strong parties hostile to Becket: the King's officers who held in sequestration the estates of the see, and seem to have especially coveted the receipt of the Michaelmas rents; and with these some of the fierce warrior nobles, who held lands or castles which were claimed as possessions of the Church of Canterbury. Randolph de Broc, his old inveterate enemy, was determined not to surrender his castle of Saltwood. It was reported to Becket, by Becket represented to the King, that De Broc had sworn that he would have Becket's life before he had eaten a loaf of bread in England. The castle of Rochester was held on the same doubtful title by one of his enemies. The second party was that of the bishops, which was powerful, with a considerable body both of the clergy and laity. They had sufficient influence to urge the King's officers to take the strongest measures, lest the Papal letters of excommunication should be introduced into the kingdom.

It is perhaps vain to conjecture, how far, if Becket

¹ It is called the Pax.

had returned to England in the spirit of meekness, forgiveness, and forbearance, not wielding the thunders of excommunication, nor determined to trample on his adversaries, and to exact the utmost even of his most doubtful rights, he might have resumed his see, and gradually won back the favor of the King, the respect and love of the whole hierarchy, and all the legitimate possessions of his church. But he came not in peace, nor was he received in peace.¹ It was not the Archbishop of Rouen, as he had hoped, but his old enemy John of Oxford, who was commanded by the King to accompany him, and reinstate him in his see. The King might allege that one so much in the royal confidence was the best protector of the Archbishop. The money which had been promised for his voyage was not paid; he was forced to borrow 300*l.* of the Archbishop of Rouen. He went, as he felt, or affected to feel, with death before his eyes, yet nothing should now separate him from his long-divided flock. Before his embarkation at Whitsand in Flanders, he received intelligence that the shores were watched by his enemies, it was said with designs on his life,² but assuredly with the determination of making a rigid search for the letters of excommunication.³ To secure the safe carriage of one of these perilous documents, the suspension of the Archbishop of York, it was intrusted to a nun

Becket prepares for his return.

Letters of excommunication sent before him.

¹ Becket disclaims vengeance: "*Neque hoc dicimus, Deo teste, vindictam expetentes, quum scriptum esse noverimus, non quæres ultionem . . . sed ut ecclesia correctionis exemplo possit per Dei gratiam in posterum roborare, et pœnâ paucorum multos ædificare.*" — Giles, iii. 76.

² See Becket's account. — Giles, iii. p. 81.

³ Lambeth says: "*Visum est autem nonnullis, quod incircumspectè literarum vindictâ post pacem usus est, quæ tantum pacis desperatione fuerint data.*" — p. 116. Compare pp. 119 and 152.

named Idonea, whom he exhorts, like another Judith, to this holy act, and promises her as her reward the remission of her sins.¹ Other contraband letters were conveyed across the channel by unknown hands, and were delivered to the bishops before Becket's landing.

The Prelates of York and London were at Canterbury when they received these Papal letters. When the fulminating instruments were read before them, in which was this passage, "we will fill your faces with ignominy," their countenances fell. They sent messengers to complain to Becket, that he came not in peace, but in fire and flame, trampling his brother bishops under his feet, and making their necks his footstool; that he had condemned them uncited, unheard, unjudged. "There is no peace," Becket sternly replied, "but to men of good-will."² It was said that London was disposed to humble himself before Becket; but York,³ trusting in his wealth, boasted that he had in his power the Pope, the King, and all their courts.

Instead of the port of Dover, where he was expected, Becket's vessel, with the archiepiscopal banner displayed, cast anchor at Sandwich. Soon after his landing, appeared in arms the Sheriff of Kent, Randulph de Broc, and others of his enemies. They searched his baggage, fiercely demanded that he should absolve the bishops, and endeavored to force the Archdeacon of Sens, a foreign ecclesiastic, to take an oath

Lands at
Sandwich.
Dec. 1.

¹ Lord Lyttelton has drawn an inference from these words unfavorable to the purity of Idonea's former life; and certainly the examples of the Magdalene and the woman of Egypt, if this be not the case, were unhappily chosen.

² Fitz-Stephen, pp. 281, 284.

³ Becket calls York his ancient enemy: "*Lucifer ponens sedem suam in aquilone.*"

to keep the peace of the realm. John of Oxford was shocked, and repressed their violence. On his way to Canterbury the country clergy came forth with their flocks to meet him; they strewed their garments in his way, chanting, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Arrived at Canterbury, he ^{At Canter-} rode at once to the church with a vast pro-^{bury.} cession of clergy, amid the ringing of the bells, and the chanting of music. He took his archiepiscopal throne, and afterwards preached on the text, "Here we have no abiding city." The next morning came again the Sheriff of Kent, with Randolph de Broc, and the messengers of the bishops, demanding their absolution.¹ Becket evaded the question by asserting that the Excommunication was not pronounced by him, but by his superior the Pope; that he had no power to abrogate the sentence. This declaration was directly at issue with the bull of excommunication: if the bishops gave satisfaction to the Archbishop, he had power to act on behalf of the Pope.² But to the satisfaction which, according to one account, he did demand, that they should stand a public trial, in other words place themselves at his mercy, they would not, and hardly could submit. They set out immediately to the King in Normandy.

The restless Primate was determined to keep alive the popular fervor, enthusiastically, almost ^{Goes to} fanatically, on his side. On a pretext of a ^{London.}

¹ Becket accuses the bishops of thirsting for his blood! "Let them drink it." But this was a phrase which he uses on all occasions, even to William of Pavia.

² "Si vero ita eidem Archiepiscopo et Cantuarensi Ecclesiæ satisfacere inveniretis, ut pœnam istam ipse videat relaxandam, vice nostrâ per illum volumus adimpleri." — Apud Bouquet, p. 461.

visit to the young King at Woodstock, to offer him the present of three beautiful horses, he set forth on a state-ly progress. Wherever he went he was received with acclamations and prayers for his blessings by the clergy and the people. In Rochester he was entertained by the Bishop with great ceremony. In London there was the same excitement: he was received in the palace of the Bishop of Winchester in Southwark. Even there he scattered some excommunications.¹ The Court took alarm, and sent orders to the prelate to return to his diocese. Becket obeyed, but alleged as the cause of his obedience, not the royal command, but his own desire to celebrate the festival of Christmas in his metropolitan church. The week passed in holding sittings in his court, where he acted with his usual promptitude, vigor, and resolution against the intruders into livings, and upon the encroachments on his estates; and in devotions most fervent, mortifications most austere.²

His rude enemies committed in the mean time all kinds of petty annoyances, which he had not the loftiness to disdain. Randolph de Broc seized a vessel laden with rich wine for his use, and imprisoned the sailors in Pevensey Castle. An order from the court compelled him to release ship and crew. They robbed the people who carried his provisions, broke into his park, hunted his deer, beat his retainers; and, at the

¹ "Ipse tamen Londonias adiens, et ibi missarum solenniis celebratis, quosdam excommunicavit." — Passio. iii. p. 154.

² Since this passage was written an excellent and elaborate paper has appeared in the Quarterly Review, full of local knowledge. I recognize the hand of a friend from whom great things may be expected. I find, I think, nothing in which we disagree, though that account, having more ample space, is more particular than mine. (Reprinted in *Memorials of Canterbury* by Rev. A. P. Stanley.)

instigation of Randolph's brother, Robert de Broc, a ruffian, a renegade monk, cut off the tail of one of his state horses.

On Christmas day Becket preached on the appropriate text, "Peace on earth, good-will towards men." The sermon agreed ill with the text. He spoke of one of his predecessors, St. Alphege, who had suffered martyrdom. "There may soon be a second." He then burst out into a fierce, impetuous, terrible tone, arraigned the courtiers, and closed with a fulminating excommunication against Nigel de Sackville, who had refused to give up a benefice into which, in Becket's judgment, he had intruded, and against Randolph and Robert de Broc. The maimed horse was not forgotten. He renewed in the most vehement language the censure on the bishops, dashed the candle on the pavement in token of their utter extinction, and then proceeded to the mass at the altar.¹

In the mean time the excommunicated prelates had sought the King in the neighborhood of Ba-
yeux; they implored his protection for them-
selves and the clergy of the realm. "If all are to be visited by spiritual censures," said the King, "who officiated at the coronation of my son, by the eyes of God, I am equally guilty." The whole conduct of Becket since his return was detailed, and no doubt deeply darkened by the hostility of his adversaries. All had been done with an insolent and seditious design of alienating the affections of the people from the King. Henry demanded counsel of the prelates; they declared themselves unable to give it. But one incautiously said, "So long as Thomas lives, you will never

The bishops
with the
King.

¹ Fitz-Stephen, De Bosham, Grim. *in loc.*

be at peace." The King broke out into one of his terrible constitutional fits of passion ; and at length let fall the fatal words, " Have I none of my thankless and cowardly courtiers who will relieve me from the insults of one low-born and turbulent priest ? "

These words were not likely to fall unheard on the ears of fierce and warlike men, reckless of bloodshed, possessed with a strong sense of their feudal allegiance, and eager to secure to themselves the reward of desperate service. Four knights, chamberlains of the King, Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Moreville, and Reginald Brito, disappeared from the court.¹ On the morrow, when a grave council was held, some barons are said, even there, to have advised the death of Becket. Milder measures were adopted : the Earl of Mandeville was sent off with orders to arrest the primate ; and as the disappearance of these four knights could not be unmarked, to stop them in the course of any unauthorized enterprise.

But murder travels faster than justice or mercy. They were almost already on the shores of England. It is said that they met in Saltwood Castle. On the 28th of December, having, by the aid of Randolph de Broc, collected some troops in the streets of Canterbury, they took up their quarters with Clarembold, Abbot of St. Augustine's.

The assassination of Becket has something appalling, with all its terrible circumstances seen in the remote past. What was it in its own age ? The most dis-

¹ See, on the former history of these knights, *Quarterly Review*, vol. xciii. p. 355. The writer has industriously traced out all that can be known much which was rumored about these men.

tinguished churchman in Christendom, the champion of the great sacerdotal order, almost in the hour of his triumph over the most powerful king in Europe; a man, besides the awful sanctity inherent in the person of every ecclesiastic, of most saintly holiness; soon after the most solemn festival of the Church, in his own cathedral, not only sacrilegiously, but cruelly murdered, with every mark of hatred and insult. Becket had all the dauntlessness, none of the meekness of the martyr; but while his dauntlessness would command boundless admiration, few, if any, would seek the more genuine sign of Christian martyrdom.

The four knights do not seem to have deliberately determined on their proceedings, or to have resolved, except in extremity, on the murder. The knights before Becket.

They entered, but unarmed, the outer chamber.¹ The Archbishop had just dined, and withdrawn from the hall. They were offered food, as was the usage; they declined, thirsting, says one of the biographers, for blood. The Archbishop obeyed the summons to hear a message from the King; they were admitted to his presence. As they entered, there was no salutation on either side, till the Primate having surveyed, perhaps recognized them, moved to them with cold courtesy. Fitz-Urse was the spokesman in the fierce altercation which ensued. Becket replied with haughty firmness. Fitz-Urse began by reproaching him with his ingratitude and seditious disloyalty in opposing the coronation of the King's son, and commanded him, in instant obedience to the King, to absolve the prelates. Becket protested that so far from wishing to diminish the

¹ Tuesday, Dec. 29. See, on the fatality of Tuesday in Becket's life, Q. R. p. 357.

power of the King's son, he would have given him three crowns and the most splendid realm. For the excommunicated bishops he persisted in his usual evasion that they had been suspended by the Pope, by the Pope alone could they be absolved; nor had they yet offered proper satisfaction. "It is the King's command," spake Fitz-Urse, "that you and the rest of your disloyal followers leave the kingdom."¹ "It becomes not the King to utter such command: henceforth no power on earth shall separate me from my flock." "You have presumed to excommunicate, without consulting the King, the King's servants and officers." "Nor will I ever spare the man who violates the canons of Rome, or the rights of the Church." "From whom do you hold your archbishopric?" "My spirituals from God and the Pope, my temporals from the King." "Do you not hold all from the King?" "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." "You speak in peril of your life!" "Come ye to murder me? I defy you, and will meet you front to front in the battle of the Lord." He added, that some among them had sworn fealty to him. At this, it is said, they grew furious, and gnashed with their teeth. The prudent John of Salisbury heard with regret this intemperate language: "Would it may end well!" Fitz-Urse shouted aloud, "In the King's name I enjoin you all, clerks and monks, to arrest this man, till the King shall have done justice on his body." They rushed out, calling for their arms.

His friends had more fear for Becket than Becket for himself. The gates were closed and barred, but pres-

¹ Grim p. 71. Fitz-Stephen.

ently sounds were heard of those without, striving to break in. The lawless Randolph de Broc was hewing at the door with an axe. All around Becket was the confusion of terror: he only was calm. Again spoke John of Salisbury with his cold prudence — “Thou wilt never take counsel: they seek thy life.” “I am prepared to die.” “We who are sinners are not so weary of life.” “God’s will be done.” The sounds without grew wilder. All around him entreated Becket to seek sanctuary in the church. He refused, whether from religious reluctance that the holy place should be stained with his blood, or from the nobler motive of sparing his assassins this deep aggravation of their crime. They urged that the bell was already tolling for vespers. He seemed to give a reluctant consent; but he would not move without the dignity of his crosier carried before him. With gentle compulsion they half drew, half carried him through a private ^{Becket} chamber, they in all the hasty agony of ter- ^{in the} Church.

ror, he striving to maintain his solemn state, into the church. The din of the armed men was ringing in the cloister. The affrighted monks broke off the service; some hastened to close the doors; Becket commanded them to desist — “No one should be debarred from entering the house of God.” John of Salisbury and the rest fled and hid themselves behind the altars and in other dark places. The Archbishop might have escaped into the dark and intricate crypt, or into a chapel in the roof. There remained only the Canon Robert (of Merton), Fitz-Stephen, and the faithful Edward Grim. Becket stood between the altar of St. Benedict and that of the Virgin.¹ It was thought that

¹ For the accurate local description, see *Quarterly Review*, p. 367.

Becket contemplated taking his seat on his archiepiscopal throne near the high altar.

Through the open door of the cloister came rushing in The murder. the four, fully armed, some with axes in their hands, with two or three wild followers, through the dim and bewildering twilight. The knights shouted aloud, "Where is the traitor?" No answer came back. "Where is the Archbishop?" "Behold me, no traitor, but a priest of God!" Another fierce and rapid altercation followed: they demanded the absolution of the bishops, his own surrender to the King's justice. They strove to seize him and to drag him forth from the Church (even they had awe of the holy place), either to kill him without, or to carry him in bonds to the King. He clung to the pillar. In the struggle he grappled with De Tracy, and with desperate strength dashed him on the pavement. His passion rose; he called Fitz-Urse by a foul name, a pander. These were almost his last words (how unlike those of Stephen and the greater than Stephen!) He taunted Fitz-Urse with his fealty sworn to himself. "I owe no fealty but to my King!" returned the maddened soldier, and struck the first blow. Edward Grim interposed his arm, which was almost severed off. The sword struck Becket, but slightly, on the head. Becket received it in an attitude of prayer — "Lord, receive my spirit," with an ejaculation to the Saints of the Church. Blow followed blow (Tracy seems to have dealt the first mortal wound), till all, unless perhaps De Moreville, had wreaked their vengeance. The last, that of Richard de Brito, smote off a piece of his skull. Hugh of Horsea, their follower, a renegade priest surnamed Mauclerk, set his heel upon his neck, and crushed out

the blood and brains. "Away!" said the brutal ruffian, "it is time that we were gone." They rushed out to plunder the archiepiscopal palace.

The mangled body was left on the pavement; and when his affrighted followers ventured to approach to perform their last offices, an incident occurred which, however incongruous, is too characteristic to be suppressed. Amid their adoring awe at his courage and constancy, their profound sorrow for his loss, they broke out into a rapture of wonder and delight on discovering not merely that his whole body was swathed in the coarsest sackcloth, but that his lower garments were swarming with vermin. From that moment miracles began. Even the populace had before been divided; voices had been heard among the crowd denying him to be a martyr; he was but the victim of his own obstinacy.¹ The Archbishop of York even after this dared to preach that it was a judgment of God against Becket—that "he perished, like Pharaoh, in his pride."² But the torrent swept away at once all this resistance. The Government inhibited the miracles, but faith in miracles scorns obedience to human laws. The Passion of the Martyr Thomas was saddened and glorified every day with new incidents of its atrocity, of his holy firmness, of wonders wrought by his remains.

The horror of Becket's murder ran throughout Christendom. At first, of course, it was attributed to Henry's direct orders. Univer-^{Effects of the murder.}sal hatred branded the King of England with a kind of outlawry, a spontaneous excommunication. William

¹ Grim, 70.

² John of Salisbury. Bouquet, 619, 620.

of Sens, though the attached friend of Becket, probably does not exaggerate the public sentiment when he describes this deed as surpassing the cruelty of Herod, the perfidy of Julian, the sacrilege of the traitor Judas.¹

It were injustice to King Henry not to suppose that with the dread as to the consequences of this act must have mingled some reminiscences of the gallant friend and companion of his youth and of the faithful minister, as well as religious horror at a cruel murder, so savagely and impiously executed.² He shut himself for three days in his chamber, obstinately refused all food and comfort, till his attendants began to fear for his life. He issued orders for the apprehension of the murderers,³ and despatched envoys to the Pope to exculpate himself from all participation or cognizance of the crime. His ambassadors found the Pope at Tusculum: they were at first sternly refused an audience. The afflicted and indignant Pope was hardly prevailed on to permit the execrated name of the King of England to be uttered before him. The cardinals still friendly to the King with difficulty obtained knowledge of Alexander's determination. It was, on a fixed day, to pronounce with the utmost solemnity, excommunication against the King by name, and an interdict on all

¹ Giles, iv. 162. Bouquet, 467. It was fitting that the day after that of the Holy Innocents should be that on which should rise up this new Herod.

² See the letter of Arnulf of Lisieux. — Bouquet, 469.

³ The Quarterly reviewer has the merit of tracing out the extraordinary fate of the murderers. "By a singular reciprocity, the principle for which Becket had contended, that priests should not be subjected to the secular courts, prevented the trial of a layman for the murder of a priest by any other than a clerical tribunal." Legend imposes upon them dark and romantic acts of penance; history finds them in high places of trust and honor. — pp. 377, *et seq.* I may add that John of Oxford five years after was Bishop of Norwich. Ridel too became Bishop of Ely.

his dominions, on the Continent as well as in England. The ambassadors hardly obtained the abandonment of this fearful purpose, by swearing that the King would submit in all things to the judgment of his Holiness. With difficulty the terms of reconciliation were arranged.

In the Cathedral of Avranches in Normandy, in the presence of the Cardinals Theodin of Porto, ^{Reconciliation at} and Albert the Chancellor, Legates for that ^{Avranches} especial purpose, Henry swore on the Gospels that he had neither commanded nor desired the death of Becket; that it had caused him sorrow, not joy; he had not grieved so deeply for the death of his father or his mother.¹ He stipulated — I. To maintain two hundred knights at his own cost in the Holy Land. II. To abrogate the Statutes of Clarendon, and all bad customs introduced during his reign.² III. That he would reinvest the Church of Canterbury in all its rights and possessions, and pardon and restore to their estates all who had incurred his wrath in the cause of the Primate. IV. If the Pope should require it, he would himself make a crusade against the ^{Ascension} Saracens in Spain. In the porch of the ^{Day.} May 22. 1172. church he was reconciled, but with no ignominious ceremony.

Throughout the later and the darker part of Henry's reign the clergy took care to inculcate, and the people were prone enough to believe, that all his disasters and calamities, the rebellion of his wife and of his sons, were judgments of God for the persecution if not the

¹ Diceto, p. 557.

² This stipulation, in Henry's view, cancelled hardly any; as few, and these but trifling customs, had been admitted during his reign.

murder of the Martyr Thomas. The strong mind of Henry himself, depressed by misfortune and by the estrangement of his children, acknowledged with superstitious awe the justice of their conclusions. Heaven, the Martyr in Heaven, must be appeased by a public humiliating penance. The deeper the degradation the more valuable the atonement. In less than three years after his death the King visited the tomb of Becket, by this time a canonized saint, renowned not only throughout England for his wonder-working powers, but to the limits of Christendom. As soon as he came near enough to see the towers of Canterbury, the King dismounted from his horse, and for three miles walked with bare and bleeding feet along the flinty road. The tomb of the Saint was then in the crypt beneath the church. The King threw himself prostrate before it. The Bishop of London (Foliot) preached; he declared to the wondering multitude that on his solemn oath the King was entirely guiltless of the murder of the Saint: but as his hasty words had been the innocent cause of the crime, he submitted in lowly obedience to the penance of the Church. The haughty monarch then prayed to be scourged by the willing monks. From the one end of the church to the other each ecclesiastic present gratified his pride, and thought that he performed his duty, by giving a few stripes.¹ The King passed calmly through this rude discipline, and then spent a night and a day in prayers and tears, imploring the intercession in Heaven of him whom, he thought not now on how

Penance at
Canterbury.
Fr. lay,
July 12,
1174.

¹ The scene is related by all the monkish chroniclers. — Gervaise, Diceto, Brompton, Hoveden.

just grounds, he had pursued with relentless animosity on earth.¹

Thus Becket obtained by his death that triumph for which he would perhaps have struggled in vain through a long life. He was now a Saint, and for some centuries the most popular Saint in England: among the people, from a generous indignation at his barbarous murder, from the fame of his austerities and his charities, no doubt from admiration of his bold resistance to the kingly power; among the clergy as the champion, the martyr of their order. Even if the clergy had had no interest in the miracles at the tomb of Becket, the high-strung faith of the people would have wrought them almost without suggestion or assistance. Cures would have been made or imagined; the latent powers of diseased or paralyzed bodies would have been quickened into action. Belief, and the fear of disbelieving, would have multiplied one extraordinary event into a hundred; fraud would be outbid by zeal; the invention of the crafty, even if what may seem invention was not more often ignorance and credulity, would be outrun by the demands of superstition. There is no calculating the extent and effects of these epidemic outbursts of passionate religion.²

Becket was indeed the martyr of the clergy, not of the Church; of sacerdotal power, not of Christianity; of a caste, not of mankind.³ From Becket martyr of the clergy.

¹ Peter of Blois was assured by the two cardinal legates of Henry's innocence of Becket's death. See this letter, which contains a most high-flown eulogy on the transcendent virtues of Henry. — Epist. 66.

² On the effect of the death, and the immediate concourse of the people to Canterbury, Lambeth. p. 133.

³ Herbert de Bosham, writing fourteen years after Becket's death, declares him among the most undisputed martyrs. "Quod alicujus martyrum

beginning to end it was a strife for the authority, the immunities, the possessions of the clergy.¹ The liberty of the Church was the exemption of the clergy from law; the vindication of their separate, exclusive, distinctive existence from the rest of mankind. It was a sacrifice to the deified self; not the individual self, but self as the centre and representative of a great corporation. Here and there in the long full correspondence there is some slight allusion to the miseries of the people in being deprived of the services of the exiled bishops and clergy:² "there is no one to ordain clergy, to consecrate virgins:" the confiscated property is said to be a robbery of the poor: yet in general the sole object in dispute was the absolute immunity of the clergy from civil jurisdiction,³ the right of appeal from the temporal sovereign to Rome, and the asserted superiority of the spiritual rulers in every respect over the temporal power. There might, indeed, be latent advantages to mankind, social, moral, and religious, in this secluded sanctity of one class of men; it might be

causa justior fuit aut apertior ego nec audiui, nec legi." So completely were clerical immunities part and parcel of Christianity.

¹ The enemies of Becket assigned base reasons for his opposition to the King. "*Ecclesiasticam etiam libertatem, quam defensatis, non ad animarum lucrum sed ad augmentum pecuniarum, episcopos vestros intorquere.*" See the charges urged by John of Oxford. — Giles, iv. p. 188.

² Especially in Epist. 19. "*Interim.*"

³ It is not just to judge the clergy by the crimes of individual men, but there is one case, mentioned by no less an authority than John of Salisbury, too flagrant to pass over: it was in Becket's own cathedral city. Immediately after Becket's death the Bishops of Exeter and Worcester were commissioned by Pope Alexander to visit St. Augustine's, Canterbury. They report the total dilapidation of the buildings and estates. The prior elect "*Jugi, quod hereticus damnat, fuit libidine, et hinc in fœminas, adeo impudens ut libidinem, nisi quam publicaverit, voluptuosam esse non reputat.*" He debauched mothers and daughters: "*Fornicationis abusum comparat necessitati.*" In one village he had seventeen bastards. — Epist. 810.

well that there should be a barrier against the fierce and ruffian violence of kings and barons ; that somewhere freedom should find a voice, and some protest be made against the despotism of arms, especially in a newly-conquered country like England, where the kingly and aristocratic power was still foreign : above all, that there should be a caste, not an hereditary one, into which ability might force its way up, from the most low-born, even from the servile rank ; but the liberties of the Church, as they were called, were but the establishment of one tyranny — a milder, perhaps, but not less rapacious tyranny — instead of another ; a tyranny which aspired to uncontrolled, irresponsible rule, nor was above the inevitable evil produced on rulers as well as on subjects, from the consciousness of arbitrary and autocratic power.

Reflective posterity may perhaps consider as not the least remarkable point in this lofty and tragic strife that it was but a strife for power. Verdict of posterity.

Henry II. was a sovereign who, with many noble and kingly qualities, lived, more than even most monarchs of his age, in direct violation of every Christian precept of justice, humanity, conjugal fidelity. He was lustful, cruel, treacherous, arbitrary. But throughout this contest there is no remonstrance whatever from Primate or Pope against his disobedience to the laws of God, only to those of the Church. Becket *might*, indeed, if he had retained his full and acknowledged religious power, have rebuked the vices, protected the subjects, interceded for the victims of the King's unbridled passions. It must be acknowledged by all that he did not take the wisest course to secure this which might have been beneficent influence. But as to what appears, if

the King would have consented to allow the churchmen to despise all law — if he had not insisted on hanging priests guilty of homicide as freely as laymen — he might have gone on unreprieved in his career of ambition ; he might unrebuked have seduced or ravished the wives and daughters of his nobles ; extorted without remonstrance of the Clergy any revenue from his subjects, if he had kept his hands from the treasures of the Church. Henry's real tyranny was not (would it in any case have been ?) the object of the churchman's censure, oppugnancy, or resistance. The cruel and ambitious and rapacious King would doubtless have lived unexcommunicated and died with plenary absolution.

CHAPTER IX.

ALEXANDER III. AND THE POPES TO THE CLOSE OF THE
TWELFTH CENTURY.

THE history of Becket has been throughout almost its whole course that of Pope Alexander III.: it has shown the Pontiff as an exile in France, and after his return to Rome. The support of the English Primate, more or less courageous and resolute, or wavering and lukewarm, has been in exact measure to his own prosperity and danger. When Alexander seems to abandon the cause of the English Primate, he is trembling before his own adversaries, or embarrassed with increasing difficulties; when he boldly, either through himself or his legates, takes part against the King of England, it is because he feels strong enough to stand without the countenance or without the large pecuniary aids lavished by Henry.

Alexander remained in France above three years. During that time the kingdom of Sicily was ^{April, 1162,} restored to peace and order; the Emperor ^{to Sept.} 1165. had returned to Germany, where he seemed likely to be fully occupied with domestic wars; the Italian republics were groaning under the oppressive yoke of their conqueror, which they were watching the opportunity to throw off: Milan, given up to ruin, fire, and, most destructive of all, to the fury of her enemies,

razed to the earth, if not sown with salt. Lodi, Cremona, Pavia, had risen from her ashes ; but walls had grown up, trenches sunk around the condemned city. Her old allies had rivalled in zeal, activity, and devotion her revengeful foes. Her scattered citizens had returned. The Archbishop's palace towered in its majesty, the churches lifted up their pinnacles and spires, the republic had resumed its haughtiness, its turbulence.¹ The Antipope Victor was dead,² but a new Antipope was not wanting. The Emperor might, without loss of honor, have made peace with Alexander ; but the Imperialist churchmen dared not trust a Pope whom they had denied to be Pope. The Archbishop of Cologne and the German and Lombard prelates proclaimed Guido of Crema by the title of Paschal III. ; he was consecrated by the Bishop of Liege. But the Antipope had not dared to contest Rome ; he was, in fact, a German Antipope overawed by German prelates. In Rome the vicegerent of Pope Alexander ruled with almost undisturbed sway ; but in that vicegerent had taken place an important change. Julius, the Cardinal of Palestrina, died ; the Cardinal of St. John and St. Paul was appointed in his place. This Cardinal was a man of great address and activity. By artful language and well-directed bribery, notwithstanding all the opposition of Christian, the Chancellor of the Empire, he won over the versatile people : the senate were entirely at his disposal.

The Pope, at the summons of his Vicar, and lavishly

¹ Ann. 1162. On the extent of the destruction of Milan, and its restoration, compare Verri, *Storia di Milano*, c. vii. He gives the authorities in full.

² April 1164. In Lucca.

supplied with money by the Kings of France and England, embarked, on the octave of the Assumption of the Virgin, at Marseilles, himself in one vessel, the cardinals of his party and Oberto, the anti-Imperialist Archbishop of Milan, in another. They were watched by the fleet of Pisa, in the interests of the Emperor. The vessel which conveyed the cardinals was taken, searched in vain for the person of the Pope, and then released; that with the Pope on board put back into the port. Shortly after in a smaller and swift-sailing bark he reached Messina: there he received a splendid embassy from the King of Sicily; several large vessels were placed at his command. The Archbishop of Reggio (in Calabria) and many barons of Southern Italy joined themselves to the cardinals around him. The fleet landed at Ostia: the clergy and senators of Rome crowded to pay their homage to the Pope. He was escorted to the city by numbers bearing olive-branches. At the Lateran gate the clergy in their sacred vestments, the authorities of the city and the militia under their banners, the Jews with their Bible in their hands, presented themselves; and in the midst of this festive procession he took possession of the Lateran palace.

But it was not the policy of the Hohenstaufen Emperor to desert the cause of his Antipope, and to leave Alexander in secure possession of Rome. After the Pope had occupied Rome for a year, in the following year Frederick crossed the Alps with a great force. Rainald, Archbishop of Cologne and Archchancellor of Italy, preceded his march towards the south. Pisa received him: the Alexandrine archbishop,

Sept. 1165.
Alexander
embarks for
Italy

Early in
November.

Nov. 22.

Nov. 24.

A.D. 1167.

Villani, was degraded, Benencasa installed as archbishop.¹ Rome was notoriously the prize of the highest bidder; it had been bought by Alexander with the gold of France, England, and Sicily;² many were disposed to be bought again by the Emperor. Rainald of Cologne, an active, daring, and unscrupulous partisan, made great progress in the neighborhood of Rome and in Rome itself in favor of the Antipope. The Emperor, at the head of his army, moved slowly southwards. Instead, however, of marching direct to Rome, he sat down before Ancona, which had returned or been resubdued to its allegiance to the Byzantine Empire; for the Byzantine Manuel Comnenus had found leisure to mingle himself again in the affairs of Italy; he even aspired to reunite Rome to what the Byzantines still called the Roman Empire.³ Ancona made a brave resistance, and the Imperial forces were thus diverted from the capital.

The feeble Romans were constant to one passion alone, the hatred of their neighbors; that hatred was now centred on Tusculum. Notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the more prudent Pope, the whole militia of Rome, on whom depended the power of re-

¹ "Quem venerabilis Pasqualis cum cancellario, et cardinalibus gloriose recepit." — Marangoni, p. 47.

² "Roma si invenerit emptorem, venalem se præberet." — Vit. Alex. III.

³ Cinnamus, vi. 4, p. 261, ed. Bonn. According to the Byzantine, the Pope had agreed to this. Ἐς τὸ πάλαι ἔθος ἀνακεχωρηκέναι τοῦ ἐν Ρώμῃ ἀρχιερέως συνομολογήσαντος. Alexander was well content to accept Greek gold, not Greek rule. Did Manuel fondly believe his sincerity? In 1171 (Feb. 28), Alexander, alarmed at a proposition of marriage between the son of the Emperor Frederick and the daughter of the King of France, offers to the King of France to procure for his daughter the hand of the son of the Byzantine emperor, "whose treasury is inexhaustible." "Sanè apud imperatorem (Constantinopolitanum) regnum et consanguinei puellæ ærarium indeficiens semper invenient." — Apud Bouquet, xv. 901.

sistance to the Emperor, marched out to attack the detested neighbor. They suffered a disgraceful defeat by a few German troops, headed by the Archbishop of Mentz, their general, and the garrison of Tusculum under the command of the Archbishop of Cologne. Their loss was great and irreparable, 1000 slain, 2000 prisoners: the prowess of these ^{End of May, 1167.} warlike churchmen afflicted even to tears but did not subdue the courage of the resolute Pontiff.¹ He strengthened as far as he could the fortifications of Rome; a few troops were obtained from the Queen Regent of Sicily (William II. was now dead) and the youthful king. Frederick had broken up the siege of Ancona; he reached Rome, and easily got possession of the Leonine city; the Vatican alone maintained an obstinate defence, till some of the buildings caught fire and compelled the garrison to capitulate. The Antipope took possession of St. Peter's, reeking with blood up to the high altar,² and performed the papal July 30. functions. The Emperor attended; the Empress Beatrice received the imperial diadem, and the crown of Frederick was blessed again by the Pontiff.

Alexander seemed at first determined to defend to the utmost the city on the other side of the Tiber. Some Sicilian vessels had sailed up the river to bring supplies of money and to convey him away. Alexander refused to embark. The Frangipanis and the house of Peter Leonis were firm and united in his

¹ "Paucissimi evaserunt, qui non occisi, aut captivati fuerint." — *Chronicon Reichsperg*. The best account of the victory of these martial prelates is in Otto de Saint Blaise, c. xx.

² Otto de Saint Blaise. He says that the imperial troops hewed down the gates of Saint Peter's with axes and hatchets, and fought their way to the high altar, slaying as they went. — Compare Marangoni, p. 48.

cause. Before long he thought it more prudent to escape in disguise to Gaeta; there he resumed the pontifical attire and withdrew to Benevento.

Alexander
at Bene-
vento.

Rome consoled herself for her enforced submission by the reëstablishment of her senate in supreme authority. The Emperor endeavored, by the grant of various immunities, to secure the fidelity of the people; but the Frangipanis, the Peter Leonis, and many of the nobles, remained aloof in sullen silence, and kept within their impregnable fortress palaces. But the Pope had a more powerful ally. Never did the climate of Rome so fearfully humiliate the pride of the Emperor, or work with such awful force for the liberation of Italy.¹ No wonder that the visible hand of God was seen in the epidemic which broke out in the German army. It seemed, as has been said, commissioned with especial violence against those rebellious churchmen who had taken part and stood in arms against the lawful Pope. The Archbishop elect of Cologne, the Bishops of Prague, Liege, Spire, Ratisbon, Verdun, Augsburg, Zeitz, were among its first victims. With them perished Duke Frederick of Swabia, the young Duke Guelf, in whom expired the line of the Estensian Guelfs. The pestilence was no less terrific from its rapidity than from its intensity. Men were, in perfect health in the morning, dead before the evening: it was hardly possible to perform the rites of decent burial. The Emperor broke up his camp in the

¹ Here perhaps may once more be cited Peter Damiani's lines, almost equally appropriate on every German invasion:

"Roma vorax hominum, domat ardua colla virorum,
Roma ferax febrium, necis est uberrima frugum,
Romanæ febres stabili sunt jure fideles." — c. lxxii.

utmost haste, retreated, not without hostile resistance in the pass of Pontremoli, by Lucca and Pisa ^{Retreat of Barbarossa.} to Pavia. Of nobles, bishops, knights, and ^{Sept. 4, 1167.} squires, not reckoning the common soldiers, he had lost 2000 by the plague and during his retreat. Nor was this the worst: all Lombardy was in arms. A league had been formed to throw off his tyrannical yoke by Venice, Verona and all her dependencies, Vicenza, Padua, Treviso, Ferrara, Brescia, Bergamo, Cremona, Milan, Lodi, Piacenza, Parma, Mantua, Modena, and Bologna. The Emperor was not safe in Pavia: early in the spring of the next year the haughty Barbarossa hardly found his way to Germany in disguise; ^{A.D. 1168.} with greater difficulty the wreck of his army stole through the passes of the Alps.¹

With the flight of the Emperor fell the cause of the Antipope. City after city declared its allegiance to Alexander. The Antipope maintained himself in St. Peter's, but his death in the autumn of the ^{Sept. 20, 1168.} year might have been expected to terminate the schism. No single cardinal of his faction remained; but the obstinate few who adhered to him persuaded John, formerly Abbot of Struma, now Bishop of Tusculum, to assume the papacy under the name of Calixtus III. His legates were received by Fred- ^{June 23, 1169.} erick at a great Diet at Bamberg; yet the ^{1170.} Emperor did not scruple during the following year to send Eberhard, the Bishop of Bamberg, to negotiate with Alexander, now avowedly the head of the Lombard League. The great fortress which had been

¹ "Sicque evadens Imperator, transcursis Alpibus, exercitum, morte, morbo, omnique miseriâ confectum, in patriam reduxit." — Otto de Saint Blaise, c. xx.

erected in the plains of Piedmont, as the impregnable place of arms for the League, was named after the Pope, Alexandria. The Pontiff was too sagacious not to perceive that the object of these peaceful offers was to alienate him from his allies, the King of Sicily, the Emperor of Constantinople, and the Lombard cities. The Pope received Eberhard of Bamberg at Veroli; as the Bishop had no authority to acknowledge him unreservedly as Pope, he was dismissed with haughty courtesy. Yet Alexander dared not to take up his abode in Rome. The Prefect still commanded there in the name of the Emperor; and Tusculum, hard pressed by the Romans, whom the Prefect could not but indulge in their hope of vengeance for their late defeat, surrendered first to the Prefect, afterwards to the Pope as the mightier protector. To increase the confusion, Manuel the Eastern Emperor pressed more vigorously his intrigues to regain a footing in Italy. He condescended to court the Frangipani by granting his daughter in marriage to a prince of that powerful house. The Pope, still at Veroli, gave his blessing to the nuptials. A. D. 1172. Rome now offered her unqualified allegiance to the Pope at the price of the sacrifice of Tusculum,² which had yielded herself into his hands, and where he had held his papal state more than two years. Alexander consented to raze her impregnable walls; his treachery to Tusculum was punished by the treachery of the Romans. When the walls of her hated rival were levelled they laughed to scorn their own agreement. Alexander retired to Anagni, revenging him-

¹ Alexander was at Veroli from March to September.

² His bulls bear date at Tusculum, from Oct. 17, 1170, to Jan. 1173. — Jaffé, *Regesta*.

self by fortifying again the denuded city of Tusculum.¹

It was not till above three years after, when the pride of Barbarossa had been humbled by his total defeat at Legnano, the battle-field in May 29, 1176. Defeat of Legnano. which the Lombard republics won their independence, that Alexander could trust the earnest wishes of the Emperor for peace. The Emperor could no longer refuse to recognize a pontiff at the head of the League of his conquerors; it was of awful omen that the fortress named after the Pope had borne before the fatal battle all the brunt of the war, and defied his mightiest armament. A secret treaty, now that a treaty was necessary for both parties, arranged the chief Nov. 12. points in dispute between the Pope and the Emperor; the general pacification was not publicly proclaimed till the following year.

Then the Pope, under the safe-conduct of the Emperor, embarked with his retinue in eleven stately galleys, for Venice. He was received with the highest honors by the Doge, Sebastiano Ziani,² and the senators. Some dispute took place as to the city in which was to be holden the general congress; the Lombards proposed Bologna; the Emperor Venice; and Venice was at length agreed upon by all parties. But though the terms of reconciliation between the Pope and the Emperor might be arranged with no great difficulty, and on their main points had been settled before at Anagni (the full recognition of Alexander — the abandonment of the Antipope, was the one important article), more embarrassing

¹ He was at Segni, Jan. 27, 1173; at Anagni, March 23.

² He embarked at Viesti, March 9, 1177.

questions arose on the terms insisted on by the Pope's allies, especially the Lombard republics. The Emperor demanded the full acknowledgment of all the imperial rights recognized at the diet of Roncaglia, and claimed or enjoyed by his predecessors. The republics insisted on the confirmation of their customs as recognized by the late emperors, Henry V., Conrad, and Lothair.

Truce of Venice. As peace seemed impracticable, the Pope at length suggested a truce. The Emperor at first indignantly rejected this proposition, but was prevailed on to yield to a truce of six years with the Lombard League; of fifteen with the King of Sicily. In the mean time the Emperor was to retain possession of the domains of the Countess Matilda; after that they were to revert to the Pope. The Lombards bitterly complained of this abandonment of their cause; they had borne the brunt and expenditure of the war; the Pope only consulted his own advantage. But Alexander judged more wisely of their real interests. The cities during the truce were more likely to increase in wealth and power, might quietly strengthen their fortifications, and gather the resources of war; the Emperor, in that time, might be involved in new hostilities in Germany. At all events the Christian prelate might fully determine to obtain a suspension of arms, if he could not a permanent peace: the chances of peace were better for all parties than those of war.

The Emperor then advanced towards Venice. When he arrived at Chioggia, the eager and tumultuous populace were disposed to transport him into the city, without precaution or exchange of hostages. The distrustful Pope was so alarmed, that he kept his galleys prepared for flight. The Lombard deputies actually

set out towards Treviso. But the grave wisdom of the Doge Ziani, and of the senate, appeased the popular movement, arranged and guaranteed the ceremonial for the proclamation of the peace on the meeting of the Pope and of the Emperor.

On Tuesday the 24th of July, the Pope went in great state to the Church of St. Mark: the Doge, with the Bucentaur, and other splendid galleys, to meet the Emperor at S. Niccolo del Lido.¹ The bishops of Ostia, Porto, and Palestrina, with other cardinals, were sent forward to absolve the Emperor and his adherents from the ban of excommunication. The warlike Archbishop of Mentz, and the other German prelates, abjured the Antipopes, Octavian, Guido of Crema, and John of Struma. The Emperor, with the Doge and senators, and with his own Teutonic nobles, advanced to the portal of St. Mark's, where stood the Pope in

¹ Daru alone, of modern historians, adheres to the old fables, as old as the fourteenth century, of the march of Frederick towards Anagni; the flight of the Pope in disguise to Venice, where he was recognized; Frederick's pursuit to Tarento; the defeat of his great fleet of seventeen large galleys by the Venetians, and the capture of his son Otho; finally, the Pope's insolent behavior to the Emperor, his placing his feet upon his neck, with the words, "*Super aspidam et basiliscum ponam pedes nostros*;" Frederick's indignant reply, "*Non tibi, sed Petro*." The account appears in a passage of Dandolo (in Chron.) of questioned authenticity, which appeals to, but does not cite, earlier Venetian histories. But the total silence and the irreconcilable accounts of the contemporary historians and of the Papal letters must outweigh these dubious authorities. A more powerful, but, from his Venetian patriotism, less impartial, advocate than Daru, Paolo Sarpi, had before maintained the same views. Yet such a fiction is extraordinary. Venetian pride might invent the part which redounds to the glory of Venice: but who invented the striking interview between the Emperor and the Pope? It is not an improbable suggestion, that it originated in paintings, representing the Pope and the Emperor in such attitudes. The paintings are by Spinello, a Siennese, of which city Alexander III. was a native. Compare the vivid description of these frescoes, Lord Lindsay, *Hist. of Christian Art*, ii. 315. Spinello painted in the latter half of the fourteenth century. As Poetry has so often become, here Painting for once became History.

his pontifical attire. Frederick no sooner beheld the successor of St. Peter, than he threw off his imperial mantle, prostrated himself, and kissed the feet of the Pontiff. Alexander, not without tears, raised him up, and gave him the kiss of peace. Then swelled out the *Te Deum*; and the Emperor, holding the hand of the Pope, was led into the choir, and received the papal benediction. From thence they proceeded together to the Ducal Palace.¹ The next day, the feast of St. James the Apostle, the Pope celebrated mass, and preached to the people. The Emperor held his stirrup when he departed from the church; but the courtesy of the Pope prevented him from holding the bridle along the Place of St. Mark. At a great council held in the church, the Pope excommunicated all who should infringe the treaty.

Thus Venice might seem to have the glory of mediating a peace, which at least suspended for some years all the horrors of war—the war which, throughout Italy, had arrayed city against city, on the Papal or Imperialist factions.² They had assisted in terminating a disastrous schism which had distracted Christendom for so many years.

¹ A curious passage from a newly-recovered poem, if poem it may be called, by Godfrey of Viterbo, an attendant on the Emperor, gives an incident worth notice. So great was the press in the market that the aged Pope was thrown down:—

“*Jam Papa perisset in arto,
Cæsar ibi vetulum ni relevasset eum.*”

This is an odd contrast of real life with romance. — *Apud Pertz, Archiv. iv. p. 363.*

² Muratori has given the list. On the Emperor's side were Cremona (Pisa?), Pavia, Genoa, Tortona, Asti, Albi, Acqua, Turin, Ventimiglia, Savona, Albengo, Casale, Montevro, Castel Bolognese, Imola, Faenza, Ravenna, Forlì, Forlimpopoli, Cesena, Rimini, the Marquises of Montferrat, Guasto, and Bosco, the Counts of Blandrate and Lomello. In the League, Venice, Treviso, Padua, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, Ferrara, Mantua, Ber-

Even Rome was overawed by the unity between the Emperor and the Pope. The city sent seven of her nobles to entreat Alexander to honor Rome with his presence. After some negotiation a treaty was agreed on. The senate continued to subsist, but swore fealty and rendered homage to the Pope; the Church of St. Peter, and the royalties seized by the people, were restored. Alexander took possession of the Lateran palace, and celebrated Easter with great pomp. April 9, 1178. In the August of the same year the Antipope, Calixtus III., abdicated his vain title. He had fled to Viterbo, determined to maintain a vigorous resistance; he received a message from the Emperor, threatening him, if he refused to submit, with the ban of the Empire. He fled on to Montalbano; he was received by John, the lord of that castle, whose design, it is said, was to sell him at a high price to Alexander. In Montalbano he was besieged by the Archbishop of Mentz, who wasted all the territory around.¹ Calixtus, in despair, threw himself on the mercy of his enemy; he went to Tusculum, fell at the feet of Alexander, confessed his sin of schism, and implored forgiveness. Alexander received him with Christian gentleness, and Aug. 29, 1178. even advanced him afterwards to a post of dignity — the government of the city of Benevento.

gamo, Lodi, Milan, Como, Novara, Vercelli, Alexandria, Carsino and Belmonte, Piacenza, Bobbio, the Marquis Malespina, Parma, Reggio, Modena, Bologna, Doccia, San Cassiano, &c.

¹ This fierce prelate, whom in the Treaty of Venice Pope Alexander had recognized as rightful Archbishop of Mentz, was afterwards involved in a quarrel with the Marquis of Montferrat concerning the possession of Viterbo. The people were for the archbishop, and the Pope, Lucius III., now his ally; the nobles for Conrad, son of the Marquis. The archbishop was taken and kept for some time in iron chains. He ransomed himself at a great price, fought many more battles, and died at length of a fever. — Muratori, 1179.

A great council in the Lateran was the last important act in the long and eventful pontificate of Alexander.¹ He died in Civita Castellana.

Thus closed the first act of the great tragedy, the strife of the Popes with the imperial house of Hohenstaufen. The Pope had gained a signal victory; he had won back the now uncontested papacy, and the city of Rome. He was at the head of a mighty Italian interest, both in the South and in the North, Sicily and the Lombard League. Yet though humbled, Barbarossa was still of formidable power; he had subdued, driven into exile his one dangerous German subject, the rebel Henry the Lion. Many cities, and some of the most powerful, were firmly attached to the imperial cause, the more firmly from their internecine hatred each to some other of the cities of the League; the proverbial animosity of Guelf and Ghibelline had begun to rage. Till towards the close of this century the Papacy might seem to be in quiet repose, gathering its strength for the great culminating manifestation of its power in Innocent III.

Five Popes,² neither distinguished by their personal

¹ This Council, among other acts, regulated the election of the Pope (Romuald-Salernit): he must have two thirds of the suffrages. It enacted sumptuary laws as to the horses of prelates on their visitation; hawks and hounds and costly banquets were prohibited; the Knights-Templars and Hospitallers were to be under episcopal authority; clerks to have no women in their houses. There were Canons on the house of God; in favor of lepers; against Christians furnishing arms to Saracens; against wreckers, against Jews and Saracens having Christian slaves. Cathari, Paterines, Publicans were anathematized.

² Lucius III., inaugurated Nov. 1181 . . 1185
 Urban III. " . . . 1185 . . 1187
 Gregory VIII. " . . . 1187 . . 1187
 Clement III. " . . . 1187 . . 1190
 Cœlestine III. " . . . 1190 Jan. 1193

character, nor by the events of their pontificate, passed in succession, during less than twenty years, over the scene. Of these Popes two alone honored Rome by their residence. The three first can hardly be called Bishops of Rome.

On the death of Alexander he was succeeded by a native of Lucca, Ubaldo, Bishop of Ostia and Sept. 1, 1181 Velletri. Lucius III. (this was his pontifical name) retained his residence, probably his bishopric of Velletri. Rome, rarely visited by Alexander, for six months endured the presence of her new pontiff.¹ Then Rome was again in rebellion: the Pope at Velletri, afterwards at Anagni. The cruelty and insolence of the Romans was at its height. They blinded six-and-twenty Tusculan prisoners, and set cardinals' hats on their heads; a wretch with one eye left was crowned with the papal tiara, inscribed "Lucius III., the worthless, the deceiver." In this plight they were ordered to present themselves to the Pope in Anagni.²

The Pope and the Emperor, and the north of Italy, were still at peace. Even Alexandria had opened her gates, and for a short time took the name of Cesarea. The famous treaty of Constance seemed to fix the relations of the Emperor and the Lombard republics on a lasting ground. At Verona met the Emperor and the Pope in apparent amity. Frederick had A.D. 1182. hopes that the Pope would consent to permit him to devolve the imperial crown upon his son. Lucius had the address to suggest that a second emperor could not be crowned till the reigning emperor had

¹ September, 1181, March, 1182.

² Chron. Foss nov. .

actually abdicated the empire. They parted in mutual mistrust; but the Pope remained at Verona.¹ Lucius III. had fulminated an anathema against the sects which were now spreading in the north of Italy, and were all included under the hated name of Manicheans, the Cathari, the Paterines, the Umiliati, the poor men of Lyons, the Passagini, the Giuseppini; he had visited with the like censures the Arnoldists and rebels of Rome. The Emperor left the papal thunders to their own unaided effects; he moved no troops; he would not break the peace of Italy, either to persecute the heretics, or to subdue Rome.

The cardinals, like the Pope, had abandoned the south for the north of Italy. On the death of Lucius, Nov. 25. 1185. of Lucius, Uberto, or Humbert Crivelli, his successor, Urban III., elected by twenty-seven cardinals,² retained the archbishopric of Milan (thus holding at once the two great sees of Italy); he chiefly resided at Verona. The peace of Venice had seemed but precarious during the pontificate of Lucius. Uberto Crivelli, the Archbishop of Milan, and full of Milanese as well as papal jealousy of the Emperor, was not likely to smooth away the causes of animosity. Urban the Turbulent (*Turbanus*), such was the ill-omened name which he received from his enemies, was more the republican Archbishop (in that character he had already, even in war, been among the most dangerous enemies of Barbarossa) than the supreme Pontiff. There were three fatal points in dispute, each sufficient to break up so hasty a treaty; to estrange powers who had such little sympathy with each other. In Germany

¹ He was at Verona from July 25 to his death in 1185.

² Ciacconius gives their names. — Vit. Pontif.

Frederick was accused of seizing the estates of vacant sees, confiscating all the movable property, ^{Causes of} and even compelling the alienation of farms, ^{enmity.} lands, towns, and other rights; of suppressing monasteries, especially of nuns, under the pretext that they had sunk into license and irregularity. In Italy the great question of succession to the territories of the Countess Matilda had been only adjourned; the longer the Emperor maintained the possession, the less disposed was he to fulfil his covenant for the restoration of these wealthy domains to the Roman see. The third and most dangerous controversy concerned the coronation of his son, if not as Emperor, as King of Italy. The Emperor had made with success a master-stroke of policy; he had obtained the hand of Constantia, the heiress of the kingdom of Sicily, for his son and heir Henry. The kingdom of Sicily was thus, instead of a place of refuge for the Pope against the Emperor, now an imperial territory; the King, instead of a vassal holding his realm as an acknowledged fief of the papacy, the Pope's implacable antagonist. The Pope was placed, at Rome, between two fires. Urban III. strove in vain against the perilous marriage; he resolutely refused the coronation of Henry with the iron crown of Italy: this was his function as Archbishop of Milan. The office was assumed by the Bishop of Aquileia. The conduct of the ferocious Henry, the son and heir of Barbarossa, the husband of the Sicilian Constantia, aggravated the terrors of beholding the crown of Sicily on the brows of a Hohenstaufen. While yet in Lombardy, he demanded of a bishop of whom he held the investiture of his see. "Of the Pope alone," three times replied the resolute ecclesiastic. Henry ordered his attendants to

seize, to beat, and to roll in the mire the obstinate prelate. In the south he entered into an alliance with the rebel senate of Rome. A servant of the Pope, on the way from Rome with a large sum of money, was seized by his command, stripped of his treasures, and sent empty-handed, and with his nose cut off, to the Pope. The Emperor took measures, if not of equal ferocity, of more menacing hostility. He commanded the passes of the Alps to be occupied, to prevent all communication of the German ecclesiastics with the Pope; who was all this time holding his court, it might be supposed, in the midst of the Emperor's Italian territory in Verona. He commanded the Archbishop of Cologne, the Pope's legate, to assume complete ecclesiastical supremacy, and to decide all causes without the cognizance of the Pope.¹ At a full diet at Gelnhausen, Barbarossa arraigned the Pope, as having refused to crown his son; as having excommunicated the bishops who at the Emperor's command had officiated at that ceremony; of consecrating Fulmar Archbishop of Treves, without the approbation of the Emperor. Fulmar was finally expelled; Rudolf, the Emperor's partisan, consecrated Archbishop of Treves. Frederick disposed at his will of the German sees. The German bishops were called upon to aid their Emperor in his resistance to this contumacious Pope.

¹ Urban III. writes to Wickman, Archbishop of Magdeburg, to use his good offices to soothe the Emperor. "*Communiter frequenter a sese imperialis culminis altitudinem ut ecclesiæ Romanæ restitueret possessiones, quas detineret occupatas, non eâ qua debuerat serenitate respondisse, nec videri velle perficere, per quod inter ecclesiam et imperium firma possit pax et concordia evenire.*"—Feb. 24, 1187. This from almost the immediate successor of Alexander III., the antecessor only by ten years of Innocent III., and from such a man as the turbulent Urban. It was a great stroke of policy to make Lombard Popes.

They offered their mediation ; they signed and sealed a document, imploring the Pope in these perilous times not to renew the old fatal wars ; they urged him at least to politic dissimulation ; at the same time they represented the exactions of his legates, and complained of the contributions levied by his officers on the monasteries in Germany, some of which had been reduced to penury. Urban III. at length determined on the excommunication of Frederick ; but the citizens of Verona declared that no such act of hostility should take place within their walls.

Urban departed to Ferrara ; for this act of resistance on the part of Verona was of evil augury, as Sept., Oct. to the indisposition of his only remaining allies, the Lombard republics, to risk their growing opulence in his cause. At Ferrara he died. Of his death there is an account by one who solemnly protests to the truth of his statement—he was an eye-witness. Peter of Blois rode with the Pope from Verona towards Ferrara. Peter endeavored to appease the deadly hatred which had been instilled into the soul of Urban against Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Pope, red with anger, broke out, “ May I never dismount this horse and mount another, if I do not depose him ! ” He had hardly spoken, when the cross borne before him was dashed in pieces. It was hastily tied together. At the next town Urban fell ill : he never again mounted a horse.¹ He was conveyed slowly by water to Ferrara. Through Christendom it was re-

¹ See the very curious letter of Peter of Blois. Peter says that he had been at school with Urban at Marlborough (Maldebyrig) and was also Baldwin's *commensalis*. — Epist. 216. Giles, ii. p. 165. On Baldwin's quarrel with the monks, see Collier, i. p. 393.

ported that the cause of his hatred against the English Prelate was this: Baldwin of Canterbury had set up a chapter of secular canons against the unruly monks of Canterbury; the monks appealed to Rome, and had inflamed the Pope with implacable resentment against Baldwin.

The peace of European Christendom was owing less to the respect for recent treaties, to either satiety of ambition in the contending parties, or the seeming isolation of the Pope, than to the calamities in the East. The rise of the great Saladin had appalled, it had even extorted generous admiration from the chivalrous kings of the West. But when Jerusalem fell before the Saracen, the loss afflicted all Christendom with grief and shame; at one blow all the glories of the Crusades were levelled to the dust. The war was to begin anew, and if with a nobler enemy, and one more worthy to conflict with European kings — with an enemy more formidable — one unconquered, it might seem unconquerable. Urban hardly retired to Ferrara, and died of grief, it was said (though the news could not possibly have reached Italy), for this disaster.¹

But Urban knew not that this disaster would save the papacy from its imminent peril; it diverted at once even Barbarossa himself from his hostile plans; it awed the most implacable enemies in Christendom to peace and amity. The first act of Gregory VIII.² (Albert, Cardinal of St. Lorenzo in Lucina) was to issue lamentable letters to the whole of Christendom. They described in harrowing terms the fall of Jerusalem.

¹ Urban left Verona in September; Jerusalem fell on the 2d October. Urban died on the 20th.

² Gregory, consecrated Oct. 25, 1187. The letters are dated Oct. 29.

Saladin (for the cross of Christ had ceased to be the unconquerable defence of the Christians) had overthrown the whole Christian host; had broken into the holy city; the cross itself was taken, the Bishop slain, the King a prisoner, many knights of the Temple and of St. John beheaded. This was the Divine visitation for the sins, not of the kingdom of Jerusalem, but of Christendom: it might melt the hearts, not only of all believers, but of mankind. The Pope exhorted all men to take arms, or at least to offer the amplest contributions for the relief of their imperilled brethren, and the recovery of the city, the sepulchre, the cross of the Lord. He appointed a fast for five years, to appease the wrath of God. Every Friday in the year was to be observed as Lent; on Wednesdays and Saturdays meat was forbidden. To these days of abstinence the Pope and the cardinals were to add Monday. The cardinals imposed on themselves even more exemplary duties: to take the cross, to go to the Holy Land as mendicant pilgrims, to receive no presents from those who came on business to the papal court; not to mount on horseback, but to go on foot so long as the ground on which the Saviour walked was trodden by the feet of the unbeliever.¹ Gregory set off for Pisa to reconcile the hostile republics of Pisa and Genoa, in order that their mighty armaments might combine Dec 17, 1187. for the reconquest of Palestine. But Gregory died before he had completed the second month of his pontificate.

His successor, elected two days after his decease, was by birth a Roman, Paul Cardinal of Pal-
 estrina: he took the Roman name of Clem-
 Clement III.
 Dec. 19.

¹ Hoveden.

ent III. The pontificate was rescued from the immediate influence of the northern republics, and, as a Roman, Clement had the natural ambition to restore the Papacy to Rome. Rome herself had now again grown weary of that republican freedom which was bought at the cost of her wealth, her importance, her magnificence. Rome inhabited by the Pope was the centre of the civilized world; as an independent republic, only an inheritor of a barren name and of unproductive glory. Yet must the Pope purchase his restoration by the sacrifice of Tusculum and of Tivoli; to a Roman perhaps no heartfelt sacrifice. Tivoli had become an object of jealousy, as Tusculum formerly of implacable hatred. On these terms Clement III. obtained not A.D. 1188. merely his safe return to Rome, but the restoration of the Papal royalties from the Roman people. The republic by this treaty recognized the sovereignty of the Pope; the patriciate was abolished, a prefect named with more limited powers. The senators were to be annually elected, to receive the approbation and swear allegiance to the Pope. St. Peter's Church and all its domains were restored to the Pope; of the tolls March, 1191. which were levied one third was to be expended for the use of the Roman people. The senate and people were to respect the majesty and maintain the honor and dignity of the Roman Pontiff; the Roman Pontiff to bestow the accustomed largesses on the senators, their judges, and officers.¹ Clement III. ruled in peace for two years; he died in Rome.

Hyacinth, Cardinal of St. Maria in Cosmedin, was elected to the Papacy; he took the name of April 15. Coelestine III. Coelestine III. His first act must be the

¹ The treaty in Baronius and Muratori. Antiq. Ital. Dissert. 32.

coronation of the Emperor Henry. Since the loss of Jerusalem the new Crusade had absorbed the mind of Europe. Of all these expeditions none had commenced with greater pomp, and it might seem security of victory. Notwithstanding the prowess of Saladin, could he resist the combined forces, the personal ability and valor of the three greatest monarchs of Europe? Barbarossa himself had yielded to the irresistible enthusiasm; at the head of such an army as might become the great Caesar of the West, he had set forth by land to Palestine. The Kings of France and of England, Philip Augustus, Richard the Lion-hearted, proceeded by sea. But, if possible, this Crusade was even more disastrous, achieved less and suffered more, than all before. The Emperor Frederick was drowned in a small river of Pisidia; his vast host wasted away, and part only, and that in miserable plight, reached Antioch. The jealousies of Philip Augustus of France and Richard of England made the success of their great army impossible. Philip Augustus left the fame of an accomplished traitor, Richard that of ungovernable pride and cruelty, as well as of unrivalled valor. His chivalrous courage had won the respect of Saladin, his ruthless massacres made his name the terror, for a long time, of Saracen mothers; but no permanent conquest was made; the kingdom of Jerusalem was left to sink into a barren title. Richard's short career of glory ended in his long imprisonment in Austria.

The news of Frederick's death had reached Italy before the decease of Clement III. His successor dared not refuse the coronation of Henry, now A.D. 1189. Lord of Germany and of Sicily. Fiction at times be-

comes history. It is as important to know what men were believed to do, as what they actually did. The account of Henry's coronation, in an ancient chronicler, cannot but be false in many of its most striking particulars, as being utterly inconsistent, at least with the situation if not with the character of the Coronation of the Emperor Henry. Pope, no less than with the haughty and unscrupulous demeanor of Henry. The Pope may have beheld with secret satisfaction the seizure of the Sicilian kingdom by Tancred the Norman, the progress made by his arms in the kingdom of Naples, the ill-concealed aversion of the whole realm to the Germans; he may have looked forward to the time when a new Norman kingdom, detached from the imperial alliance, might afford security to the Roman Pontiff. But Henry was still with his unbroken forces; the husband of the Queen of Naples; there was no power at hand to protect the Pope. Cœlestine could as yet reckon on no more than the precarious support of the Romans. Henry, when he appeared with his Empress and his army in the neighborhood of Rome, might, in his eager desire to secure his coronation, quietly smile at the presumptuous bearing of the Romans, who manned their walls, and though they would admit the Emperor, refused to open their gates to his German troops; he might condescend to enter alone, and to meet the Pope on the steps of St. Peter's. But the haughty and insulting conduct attributed to Pope Cœlestine only shows what Europe, to a great extent, believed to be the relation in which the Popes supposed themselves to stand towards the Emperor; the wide-spread opinion of the supremacy which they claimed, and which they exercised on all practicable occasions. "Cœles-

tine sat on his pontifical throne, holding the imperial crown between his feet; the Emperor and Empress bowed their heads, and from between the feet of the Pope received each the crown. But the Lord Pope immediately struck the crown of the Emperor with his foot and cast it to the ground, signifying that if he should deserve it, it was in the Pope's power to degrade him from the empire. The cardinals caught up the fallen crown and replaced it on the brow of the Emperor." Such was the notion of an English historian,¹ such in England was proclaimed to be the treatment of the Emperor by the Pope at this solemn time; it was received perhaps more readily, and repeated more emphatically on account of the deep hatred felt by the English nation to the ruling Emperor for his treachery to their captive sovereign King Richard.

Yet for his coronation Henry scrupled not to pay a price even more humiliating, but of which he felt not the humiliation, an act of his characteristic perfidy and cruelty. The Pope had not been able to fulfil that one of the terms of his treaty with the Roman people, which was to them of the deepest interest, the demolition of Tusculum. The city had admitted an imperial garrison to protect it from the Pope, and from Rome. The Pope demanded its surrender; without this concession he would not proceed to the corona-
Surrender of
Tusculum.
A.D. 1191.
tion. The garrison received orders, without consulting the citizens, to open the gates to the Romans. The Romans hastened to glut the vengeance of years, unchecked by Emperor or by Pope. They massacred many of the principal citizens, and mutilated the rest;

¹ Roger Hoveden. The passage is quoted with manifest satisfaction, as of undoubted authority, by Cardinal Baronius.

hardly one escaped without the loss of his eyes, his feet, his hands, or some other limb.¹ The walls were levelled to the ground, the citadel razed. Tusculum, the rival, at times the master, the tyrant of Rome, has at length disappeared. The Pope has abandoned the city, which at times enabled him to bridle the unruly populace of Rome; the Emperor one of his strongholds against the Pope himself.

Cœlestine III. during the rest of his pontificate maintained the high Christian ground, not indeed of mediator between the rivals for the kingdom of Apulia, but as protector of the distressed, the deliverer of the captive. Tancred, Count of Lecce, had been raised by the influence of the chancellor, Matthew of Salerno, to the throne of Sicily; the whole island had trembled at the chancellor's admonitions on the dangers of submission to a foreign yoke. Tancred, undisputed sovereign of Sicily, made rapid progress in the conquest of the kingdom of Naples. The Emperor, Henry, after some successes, had been baffled by the obstinate resistance of Naples; sickness had weakened his forces; he was obliged to retire to Germany. He had intrusted his Queen Constantia to the inhabitants of Salerno, who had won his confidence by loud protestations of loyalty. But there was a strong Norman party in Salerno; Constantia was delivered as a prisoner into the hands of Tancred. Cœlestine interposed. The influence of the Pope, the generous chivalry of his own disposition, or perhaps the fear that the pres-

¹ "Hi acceptâ legatione Imperatoris incautam civitatem Romanis tradiderunt qui multos peremerunt de civibus, et fere omnes sive pedibus, sive manibus, seu aliis membris mutilaverunt. Pro qua re Imperatori improperatum est multis." — Urspergen. in Chron. Sicardus Cremonen in Chron. apud Murator. Script. Ital. vol. vii.

ence and misfortunes of Constantia might awaken the sympathy of his own subjects, induced Tancred to send her to the Emperor, not merely without ransom but loaded with magnificent presents.

For another prisoner was implored the interposition of the Pope. King Richard of England had Imprisonment of King Richard. been seized, on his return from the Holy Land, by his deadly enemy Duke Leopold of Austria. The Emperor had compelled or bribed his surrender: he was now in a dungeon of the castle of Trefels. No sooner had the news of his capture reached his own dominions than the Archbishop of Rouen wrote to complain of this outrage against a King and a crusader, who as a crusader was under the special protection of the Holy See — “Unsheathe at once, most merciful father, the sword of St. Peter; show at once your debt of gratitude to such a son of the Church, that even those of lower rank may know what succor they may expect from you in their hour of necessity.” Peter of Blois, the Archdeacon of Bath, whose high reputation for letters justified the step, addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Mentz, requiring his good offices and those of the whole German clergy for the deliverance of the King. He scrupled not, in his zeal, to compare the Duke of Austria and the Emperor himself to Judas Iscariot, who sold the Lord, and as deserving the fate of Judas.¹ Eleanor the Queen Mother ad- Letters of Queen Eleanor. dressed the Pope, letter after letter, in the most vehement and impassioned language² — “On thee will

¹ Petri Blesensis, Epist. 64.

² Petri Blesensis, Epist. 143, 144, 145, 146. These letters were written, it should seem, by Peter of Blois, with his usual force, his occasional felicity, occasional pedantry of scriptural illustration, his play upon words. “Nobis in germanâ Germaniâ hæc mala germinant universis. Legati nobis jam

fall all the guilt of this tragedy: thou who art the father of orphans, the judge of widows, the comforter of those that mourn and weep, the city of refuge to all. If the Church of Rome sits silent with folded hands at such an outrage against Christ, let God arise and judge our cause. . . . Where is the zeal of Elijah against Ahab? the zeal of John against Herod? the zeal of Ambrose against Valens? the zeal of Alexander III., whom we have heard and seen awfully cutting off Frederick the father of this Prince from the communion of the faithful?" The supplication, the expostulations, became more and more bitter. "For trifling causes your cardinals are sent in all their power even to the most barbarous regions; in this arduous, in this lamentable, in this common cause, you have not appointed even a subdeacon or an acolyth. It is lucre which in our day commissions legates, not respect for Christ, not the honor of the Church, not the peace of kingdoms, not the salvation of the people. . . . You would not much have debased the dignity of the Roman See, if in your own person you had set out to Germany for the deliverance of so great a King. Restore me my son; O man of God, if thou art indeed a man of God, not a man of blood! if thou art so lukewarm in his deliverance, the Most High may require his blood at thy hands." She dwells on the great services of the Kings of England, of Henry II. to the See of Rome: his influence had retained the King of France in fidelity to Alexander; his wealth had bought the obedience of the Romans. In a second, in a third letter, she is more pressing, more pathetic — "Can your

testes promissi sunt, nec sunt missi: utque verum fatear, ligati potius quam legati."

soul be safe while you do not earnestly endeavor the deliverance of your son, the sheep of your fold, by frequent legations, by wholesome admonitions, by the thunders of commination, by general interdicts, by awful excommunications? You ought to lay down your life for him in whose behalf you are unwilling to speak or to write a single word." Celestine was unmoved by entreaties, remonstrances, rebukes. The promised legates never presented themselves so long as Richard was in prison.¹ It appears not whether from prudence or fear, but no sooner was the King released, than Celestine embraced his cause with ardor: he demanded the restitution of the ransom, the deliverance of the hostages. He excommunicated Duke Leopold of Austria and all who had been concerned in the imprisonment of Richard. The Duke of Austria, at length, being in danger of his life by a fall from his horse, was glad to purchase his release from the excommunication by obedience to the Pope's demands.

By the death of Tancred King of Sicily, and of Roger the heir of Tancred (he died, it was said, of grief for the loss of his son), and the rapid reconquest of Apulia, and even of Sicily itself, by the Emperor Henry, the Empire had again consolidated its strength. The realm of the Hohenstaufens extended from the Mediterranean to the Baltic. It might seem that the coming century, instead of beholding the Pope, after years of obstinate strife with the house of Swabia, at the culminating point of his power, and seeing the last blood of the Hohenstaufens flow upon the scaffold, might behold him sunk into a vassal of the Emperor. It might seem that, enclosed and cooped in on

¹ Richard imprisoned, Dec. 20, 1192; released, Feb. 1194.

every side, holding even spiritual communications with Christendom only by the permission of the German, the Pontiff might perhaps be compelled to yield up all the haughty pretensions of the Church under long, weary, irremediable, degrading oppression. Powers which he dared not wield, or wielded in vain, would fall into contempt; the Emperor would create Popes according to his own will, and Popes so created, having lost their independence, would lose their self-respect and the respect of mankind.

But Henry himself, by the curse which, without penetrating into the divine counsels, he may be supposed to have entailed on his race by his atrocious cruelties in Italy, by the universal execration which he brought on the German name and the Ghibelline cause, by tyranny which, after much allowance for the exaggeration of hate, is too strongly, too generally attested, contributed more, perhaps, than has been generally supposed, to the sudden growth of the Papal power.

Henry appeared in Italy: Pisa and Genoa forgot their hostilities to join their fleets in his support. Pope Cœlestine bowed before the storm. Though Henry had neither restored the English gold nor the hostages, though he still retained possession of the lands of the Countess Matilda, and was virtually under excommunication as participant in the guilt of Richard's captivity, the Pope ventured on no measure of resistance, and Henry passed contemptuously by Rome to his southern prey. The Apulian cities opened their gates; Salerno only, in the desperation of fear for her treachery to the Empress, made some resistance, and suffered accordingly.¹ Henry

The Emperor Henry in Italy.

¹ The eloquent Hugo Falcandus saw the coming ruin. "Intueri mihi

marched without further opposition from the Garigliano to the Straits of Messina, from Messina to Palermo. Palermo received him with open gates, with clouds of incense and joyous processions. The youthful William, the second son of Tancred, laid his crown at the feet of the Emperor, and received the hereditary Countship of Lecce.

The campaign began in August; the Emperor celebrated Christmas in Palermo A.D. 1194. There had been no sound of arms, no disturbance, except from the jealousy of the Pisans and Genoese: not a drop of blood had been shed. At Christmas, the period of peace and festivity, Henry laid before a great assembly of the realm letters (it was said forged)¹ but letters which even if they did not reveal, were declared to reveal, an extensive conspiracy against his power. Bishops, nobles, the royal family, were implicated in the charges. No further evidence was offered or required. Peter de Celano sat as supreme justiciary, a man dear to the hard and ruthless heart of Henry. A judicial massacre began. Arch-^{Cruelties of Henry.}bishops and bishops, counts and nobles — among them three sons of the Chancellor Matthew, Margantone the great naval captain, the Archbishop of Salerno — were apprehended, condemned, executed, or mutilated with

jam videro turbulenta barbarorum acies, et quo feruntur impetu irruentes, civitates opulentas, et loca diuturnâ pace florentia metu concutere, caede vastare, rapinis atterere et fœdere luxuriâ. . . . Nec enim aut rationis ordine regi, aut miseratione deflecti, aut religione terreri Teutonice novit insania, quam et innatus furor exagitat et rapacitas stimulat et libido præcipitat. . . . Væ tibi fons celebris et præclari nominis Arethusa, quæ ad hanc devoluta es miseriam, ut quæ poetarum solebas carmina modulari, nunc Teutonicorum ebrietatem mitiges, et eorum servias fœditati.” — Apud Murator. vii. p. 251.

¹ “*Literas fictitias et mendosas.*” — *Anon. Casin* Such were the Germans in Sicily. The French were to come!

barbarous variety of torture. Some were hanged, some buried alive, some burned; blinding and castration were the mildest punishments. The bodies of Tancred and his son were torn from their graves, the crowns plucked from their usurping brows. The Queen Sybilla, with her three daughters Aleria, Constantia, and Mardonia, were thrown into prison; the Dec. 26, 1194. young William blinded and mutilated.¹ On the very day when these fatal disclosures were made, and the work of blood began, the Empress Constantia gave birth at Jesi to Frederick Roger, afterwards the Emperor Frederick II. The Nemesis of Grecian tragedy might be imagined as presiding over the birth.

The Pope, in righteous indignation at these inhumanities, took courage, and issued the edict of excommunication against the Emperor. Excommunication, if reserved for such crimes, might have wrought more powerfully on the minds of men. But Henry was strong enough to treat such censures with disdain: he passed through Italy without condescending to notice Rome. As he passed he distributed to his faithful German followers territories, provinces, princedoms. Markwald obtained Ancona, Ravenna, and Romagna. Diephold had large lands in Apulia; at a later period he became Count of Ancona. Richard the Count of that city, the brother-in-law of Tancred, having been seized as a traitor, bound to the tail of a horse, dragged through the streets of Capua, was hung up by the leg, till the Emperor's fool, after two

¹ The cruelties of Henry are darkly told, but not overcharged, in a recent work, Cherrier, *Lutte des Papes et des Empereurs de la Maison de Suabe*, Paris, 1846. See, too, Von Raumer, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, b. vi. c. iii.

days' misery, put an end to his pain by tying a great stone to his neck. Philip, the Emperor's brother, had the domains of the Countess Matilda and all Tuscany. Philip married Irene, daughter of the Byzantine Emperor and widow of King Roger of Sicily. Not yet thirty years old, Henry VI., the Hohenstaufen, absolute master of Germany and of Italy, was at a greater height of power than had been attained by his father Barbarossa, or was subsequently reached by Frederick II. He could defy another Lombard League which was forming to control him; the feuds in Germany broke not out into open war. His proposition to make the Empire hereditary in his family, on the attractive condition that he should guarantee the hereditary descent of the great fiefs, and abandon all claims on the estates of the Church, was heard with favor, A.D. 1195.

and accepted by fifty-two princes of the empire. The great ecclesiastics were not indisposed to the measure; even the Pope hesitated, and only on mature deliberation declared himself opposed to the plan. But the election of his son Frederick as King of the A.D. 1196.

Romans was acceded to by his brothers, by all the princes, and won the reluctant consent of Albert Archbishop of Mentz. His popularity in Germany was increased by his earnest support of a new crusade, to which the death of Saladin and the feuds among his sons might give some reasonable hopes of success. Henry did not venture to withdraw his own personal presence from his European dominions; but he was liberal in his influence, in his levies, and in his contributions to the holy cause. The only op-Queen Constance.position to Henry's despotism was that of the gentler Empress, who tempered by every means in

her power the inhuman tyranny which still crushed her Sicilian subjects to the earth. So distasteful was her mildness, it was rumored abroad, that it gave rise to serious dissensions between the husband and the wife, that she had even meditated an insurrection in favor of her depressed people, and the transfer of her kingdom and of her hand to some less tyrannic sovereign. But these were doubtless the fictions of those who hoped they might be true: there was no outward breach; nothing seemed to disturb the conjugal harmony.

Henry returned to his Italian dominions, to suppress in his own person all that threatened insurrection, or which might by its strength be tempted to insurrection. He levelled the walls of Capua and Naples. He crossed to Sicily, and sat down before the insignificant castle of St. John, the chieftain of which had been driven into rebellion by the fear of being treated as a rebel. On a hot autumn day he went out to hunt in the neighboring forest, drank copiously of cold water, and exposed himself to the chill dews of the evening. A fever came on; he was with difficulty removed to Messina, and died in the arms of his wife. His son Frederick had not yet completed his second year. As soon as the Pope could be prevailed on to remove the excommunication, Henry VI. was buried in great state at Palermo.¹ Three months after Cœlestine III. followed him to the grave.² An infant was the heir of the Empire; Innocent III., in the prime of life, was Pope.

Death of
Henry.

¹ Henry died Sept. 28, 1197.

² Cœlestine died Jan. 8, 1198.

BOOK IX.

INNOCENT III.



CHAPTER I.

ROME AND ITALY.

UNDER Innocent III., the Papal power rose to its utmost height. Later Pontiffs, more especially Boniface VIII., were more exorbitant in their pretensions, more violent in their measures; but the full sovereignty of the Popedom had already taken possession of the minds of the Popes themselves, and had been submitted to by great part of Christendom. The thirteenth century is nearly commensurate with this supremacy of the Pope. Innocent III. at its commencement calmly exercised as his right, and handed down strengthened and almost irresistible to his successors, that which, at its close, Boniface asserted with repulsive and ill-timed arrogance, endangered, undermined, and shook to its base. At least from the days of Hildebrand, the mind of Europe had become familiarized with the assertion of those claims, which in their latent significance amounted to an absolute irresponsible autocracy. The essential inherent supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power, as of the soul over the body, as of eternity over time, as of Christ

The Papal
autocracy.

over Caesar, as of God over man, was now an integral part of Christianity. There was a shuddering sense of impiety in all resistance to this ever-present rule; it required either the utmost strength of mind, desperate courage, or desperate recklessness, to confront the fatal and undefined consequences of such resistance. The assertion of these powers by the Church had been, however intermittingly, yet constantly growing, and had now fully grown into determinate acts. The Popes had not merely claimed, they had established many precedents of their right to excommunicate sovereigns, and so of virtually releasing subjects from their allegiance to a king under sentence of outlawry; to call sovereigns to account not merely for flagrant outrages on the Church, but for moral delinquencies,¹ especially those connected with marriage and concubinage; to receive kingdoms by the cession of their sovereigns as feudal fiefs; to grant kingdoms which had no legitimate lord, or of which the lordship was doubtful and contested, or such as were conquered from infidels, barbarians, or heretics: as to the Empire, to interfere in the election as judge both in the first and last resort. Ideas obtain authority and dominion, not altogether from their intrinsic truth, but rather from their constant asseveration, especially when they fall in with the common hopes and fears, the wants and necessities of hu-

¹ Innocent III. lays this down broadly and distinctly: "*Cum enim non humane constitutioni sed divine potius innituntur: quia potestas nostra non ex homine sed ex Deo; nullus qui sit sane mentis ignorat, quin ad officium nostrum spectet de quocunque mortali peccato corrigere quemlibet Christianum, et si correctionem contempserit, ipsum per districtiorem ecclesiasticam coercere.*" — *Decret. Innocent III.*, sub ann. 1200, cap. 13, de *Judiciis*. Eichhorn observes on this: "*Womit denn natürlich der Grundsatz selbst, das die Kirche wegen Sündlichkeit der Handlung über jede Civilsache erkennen möge, anerkannt wurde.*" — *Rechts Geschichte*, ii. 517.

man nature. The mass of mankind have neither leisure nor ability to examine them ; they fatigue, and so compel the world into their acceptance ; more particularly if it is the duty, the passion, and the interest of one great associated body to perpetuate them, while it is neither the peculiar function, nor the manifest advantage of any large class or order to refute them. The Pope had, throughout the strife, an organized body of allies in the camp of the enemy ; the King or Emperor none, at least none below the nobles, who would not have preferred the triumph of the spiritual power. If these ideas are favored by ambiguity of language, their progress is more sure, their extirpation from the mind of man infinitely more difficult. The Latin clergy had been busy for many centuries in asserting, under the specious name of their liberty, the supremacy of the Church which was their own supremacy ; for several centuries in asserting the autocracy of the Pope as Head of the Church. This, which was true, at least on the acknowledged principles of the time, in a certain degree, was easily extended to its utmost limits ; and when it had become part of the habitual belief, it required some palpable abuse, some startling oppugnancy to the common sense of mankind, to awaken suspicion, to rouse the mind to the consideration of its groundwork, and to decompose the splendid fallacy.

Splendid indeed it was, as harmonizing with man's natural sentiment of order. The unity of the vast Christian republic was an imposing conception, which, even now that history has shown its hopeless impossibility, still infatuates lofty minds ; its impossibility, since it demands for its Head not merely that infallibility in doctrine so boldly claimed in later times, but

absolute impeccability in every one of its possessors; more than impeccability, an all-commanding, indefeasible, unquestionable majesty of virtue, holiness, and wisdom. Without this it is a baseless tyranny, a senseless usurpation. In those days it struck in with the whole feudal system, which was one of strict gradation and subordination; to the hierarchy of Church and State was equally wanting the Crown, the Sovereign Liege Lord.¹

When this idea was first promulgated in all its naked sternness by Gregory VII., it had come into collision with other ideas rooted with almost equal depth in the mind of man, that especially of the illimitable Cæsarean power, which though transferred to a German Emperor, was still a powerful tradition, and derived great weight from its descent from Charlemagne. But the imperial power, from its elective character; from the strife and intrigue at each successive election; from constant contests for the imperial crown; from the opposition of mighty houses, one or two of which were almost always nearly equal in wealth and influence to the Emperor; from the weaknesses, vices, tyrannies of the Emperors themselves, had been more and more impaired; that of the Pope, notwithstanding transient obscurations, had been silently ascending to still higher estimation. The humiliation of the Emperor was degradation; it brought contempt on the office, scarcely

¹ A letter of Innocent to the Consuls of Milan declares that it is sacrilege to doubt the decrees of a Pope; that though he is born of sinners, of a sinful race, yet, since he fills the place of him that was without sin, he who despises him despises Christ. The cause of dispute was the excommunication of Passaguerra, against which the Milanese protested as unjust. Compare the *Decretalia*, ii. and iii., on the superiority of the priesthood to the temporal power.

redeemed by the abilities, successes, or even virtues of new Sovereigns ; the humiliation of the Pope was a noble suffering in the cause of God and truth, the depression of patient holiness under worldly violence. In every schism the Pope who maintained the loftiest Churchmanship had eventually gained the superiority, the Imperializing Popes had sunk into impotence, obscurity, ignominy.

The Crusades had made the Pope not merely the spiritual, but in some sort the military suzerain of Europe ; he had the power of summoning all Christendom to his banner ; the raising the cross, the standard of the Pope, was throughout Europe a general and compulsory levy, the herr-ban of all who bore arms, of all who could follow an army. That which was a noble act of devotion had become a duty : not to assume the cross was sin and impiety. The Crusades thus became a kind of forlorn-hope upon which all the more dangerous and refractory of the temporal sovereigns might be employed, so as to waste their strength, if not lose their lives, by the accidents of the journey or by the sword of the Mohammedan. If they resisted, the fearful excommunication hung over them, and was ratified by the fears and by the wavering allegiance of their subjects. If they obeyed and returned, as most of them did, with shame and defeat, they returned shorn of their power, lowered in the public estimation, and perhaps still pursued, on account of their ill success, with the inexorable interdict. It was thus by trammeling their adversaries with vows which they could not decline, and from which they could not extricate themselves ; by thus consuming their wealth and resources on this wild and remote warfare, that the Popes, who

•

themselves decently eluded, or were prevented by age or alleged occupations from embarkation in these adventurous expeditions, broke and wasted away the power and influence of the Emperors. Conrad the first Hohenstaufen had betrayed prudent reluctance to march away from distracted Germany to the Holy Land. St. Bernard sternly demanded how he would answer at the great day of Judgment, the dereliction of this more manifest duty. The trembling Emperor acknowledged the voice of God, girt on the cross, collected the strength of the Empire, to leave their whitening bones on the plains and in the defiles of Asia Minor; he returned to Europe discomfited and fallen in the estimation of all Christendom. Frederick Barbarossa, the greatest of the Swabian house, had perished in the zenith of his power, in a small remote river in Asia Minor. During this century will appear Frederick II., probably in his heart, at least during his riper years, disdaining the enthusiasm with which the dominant feeling of the time forced him to comply, excommunicated for not taking the cross, excommunicated for not setting out to the Holy Land, excommunicated for setting out, excommunicated in the Holy Land, excommunicated for returning after having made an advantageous peace with the Mohammedans. During his whole reign he is vainly struggling to burst the fetters thus wound around him, and riveted not merely by the remorseless hostility of his spiritual antagonists, but by the irresistible sentiment of the age. On this subject there was no assumption, no abuse of Papal authority, which was not ratified by the trembling assent of Christendom. The Crusades, too, had now made the Western world tributary to the Popedom; the vast subventions raised

for the Holy Land were to a certain extent at the disposal of the Pope. The taxation of the clergy on his authority could not be refused for such an object; a tenth of all the exorbitant wealth of the hierarchy passed through his hands. An immense financial system grew up; Papal collectors were in every land, Papal bankers in every capital, to transmit these subsidies. The enormous increase of his power from this source may be conjectured; the abuses of that power, the emoluments for dispensation from vows, and other evils, will appear in the course of our history.

But after all, none of these accessory and, in some degree, fortuitous aids could have raised the Papal authority to its commanding height,¹ had it not possessed more sublime and more lawful claims to the reverence of mankind. It was still an assertion of eternal principles of justice, righteousness, and humanity. However it might trample on all justice, sacrifice righteousness to its own interests, plunge Europe in desolating wars, perpetuate strife in states, set sons in arms against their fathers, fathers against sons; it was still proclaiming a higher ultimate end. It was some-

¹ It may be well to state the chief points which the Pope claimed as his exclusive prerogative:—

I. General supremacy of jurisdiction; a claim, it is obvious, absolutely illimitable.

II. Right of legislation, including the summoning and presiding in Councils.

III. Judgment in all ecclesiastic causes arduous and difficult. This included the power of judging on contested elections, and degrading bishops, a super-metropolitan power.

IV. Right of confirmation of bishops and metropolitans, the gift of the pallium. Hence, by degrees, rights of appointment to devolved sees, reservations, &c.

V. Dispensations.

VI. The foundation of new orders.

VII. Canonization.

Compare Eichhorn, ii. p. 500.

thing that there was a tribunal of appeal, before which the lawless kings, the lawless feudal aristocracy trembled, however that tribunal might be proverbial for its venality and corruption, and constantly warped in its judgments by worldly interests. There was a perpetual provocation, as it were, to the Gospel, which gave hope where it did not give succor; which might, and frequently did, offer a refuge against overwhelming tyranny; something, which in itself rebuked rugged force, and inspired some restraint on heinous immorality.

The Papal language, the language of the clergy, was still ostentatiously, profoundly religious; it professed, even if itself did not always respect, even though it tampered with, the awful sense of retribution before an all-knowing, all-righteous God. In his highest pride, the Pope was still the servant of the servants of God; in all his cruelty he boasted of his kindness to the transgressor; every contumacious Emperor was a disobedient son; the excommunication was the voice of a parent, who affected at least reluctance to chastise. Every Pope declared, no doubt he imagined, himself the vicar and representative of Christ, and it was impossible that all the darkness which had gathered around the perfect humanity, the God in man as revealed in the Gospel, could entirely obscure all its exquisite truth, holiness, and love.

If this great Idea was ever to be realized of a Christian republic with a Pope at its head — and INNOCENT III. that a Pope of a high Christian character (in some respects, in all perhaps but one, in tolerance and gentleness almost impossible in his days, and the want of which, far from impairing, confirmed his strength) —

none could bring more lofty, more various qualifications for its accomplishment, none could fall on more favorable times than Innocent III. Innocent was an Italian of noble birth, but not of a family inextricably involved in the petty quarrels and interests of the Princesdoms of Romagna. He was of the Conti,¹ who derived their name in some remote time from their dignity. His father, Count Trasimondo of Segna (the name Trasimondo was traced to the Lombard Dukes of Spoleto, if truly, it implied Teutonic blood), married Claricia, of the senatorial house of Scotti. He was a Roman, therefore, by the mother's side, probably of a kindred attached to the liberties of the city. Lothair was the youngest of four brothers, born at Anagni. He had high ecclesiastical connections, both on his father's and his mother's side. John, the famous Cardinal of St. Mark, was his paternal uncle. Paul, the Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, by the title of St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, afterwards Pope Clement III., probably his uncle on his mother's side. The Cardinal Octavian, the firmest, ablest, and most intrepid supporter of Alexander III., was of his kindred. All these were of the high anti-Imperialist faction. The Education. early education of Lothair, at Rome, was completed by some years of study at Paris, the great school of theology; and at Bologna, that of law. He returned to Rome with the highest character for erudition and for irreproachable manners; he became a Canon of St. Peter's. The elevation of his uncle, the Cardinal of St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, to the Pontif-

¹ The Conti family boasted of nine Popes, — among them Innocent III., Gregory IX., Alexander IV., Innocent XIII.; of thirteen cardinals, according to Ciacconius.

icate as Clement III., paved the way to his rapid rise. He was elevated in his twenty-ninth year to Cardinalate. the Cardinalate under the title vacated by his uncle. Already he was esteemed among the ablest and most judicious counsellors of the supreme pontiff. The successor of Clement III., Cælestine III., was of the house of Orsini, between whom and the maternal ancestors of Lothair, the Scotti, to whom Clement III. his patron belonged, was an ancient, unreconciled feud. Cælestine III.,¹ very much advanced in years, might suspect the nepotism of his predecessor, which had raised his kinsman to such almost unprecedented rank, and had intrusted him with affairs so far beyond his years. During Cælestine's Popedom, the Cardinal Lothair either withdrew or was silently repelled from the prominent place which he had filled under the Pontificate of Clement. In his retirement he began to despise the ungrateful world, and wrote his treatise on "Contempt of the world and the misery of human life." The stern monastic energy of language throughout this treatise displays in another form the strength of Innocent's character: had he remained in seclusion he might have founded an order more severe than that of Benedict, as active as those which he was destined to sanction, the Dominicans and Franciscans. But he was to show his contempt of the world not by renouncing but by ruling it.²

¹ Cælestine was of the house of Bobo, a branch of the Orsini.

² This work, written in not inelegant Latin, is monastic to its core. It asserts the Augustinian notion of the transmission of original sin with repulsive nakedness. Nothing can be baser or more miserable than human nature thus propagated. I cannot help quoting a strange passage: "Omnes nascimur ejulantes ut nostram miseriam exprimamus. Masculus enim recenter natus dicit A, femina 'E, quotquot nascuntur ab Eva.' Quid est igitur Eva nisi heu ha! Utrumque dolentis est interjectio, doloris expri-

Cœlestine on his death-bed had endeavored to nominate his successor : he had offered to resign the Papacy if the Cardinals would elect John of Colonna. But, even if consistent with right and with usage, the words of dying sovereigns rarely take effect. Of twenty-eight Cardinals,¹ five only were absent ; of the rest the unanimous vote fell on the youngest of their body, on the Cardinal Lothair. No irregularity impaired the authority of his election ; there was no murmur of opposition or schism : the general suffrage of the clergy and the people of Rome was confirmed by the unhesitating assent of Christendom. The death of the Emperor, the infancy of his son, the state of affairs in Germany, made all secure on the side of the Empire. Lothair was only thirty-seven years old, almost an unprecedented age for a Pope ;² even a mind like his might tremble at this sudden elevation. He was as yet but in deacon's orders ; he had to accumulate those of priest, bishop, and so become Pope. It may be difficult in some cases to dismiss all suspicion of hypocrisy, when men who have steadily held the Papacy

mens magnitudinem." — i. 3. This puerility does not contrast more strongly with the practical wisdom of Innocent, than sentences like this with his haughtiness : "O superba præsumptio, et præsumptuosa superbia ! quæ non tantum Angelos Deo voluisti adæquare, sed etiam homines præsumpsisti deificare." — ii. c. 92.

¹ The list in Ciacconius, vol. ii. p. 2. Hurter, *Leben Innocent III.*, i. 73, gives the names of the absentees.

² Walter der Vogelweide, who attributes all the misery of the civil war in Germany to Innocent, closes his poem with these words (modernized by K. Simrock) : --

" Ich hörte fern in einer Klaus
Ein jammern ohne Ende :
Ein Klausner rang die Hände ;
Er klagte Gott sein bittres Leid ;

O weh, der Papst ist allzu jung, Herr Gott, hilf deiner Christenheit."

Simrock, p. 175.

before them as the object of their ambition, have affected to decline the tiara, and played off a graceful and yielding resistance. But the strength, as well as the deep religious seriousness of Lothair's character, might make him naturally shrink from the assumption of such a dignity at an age almost without example; and in times if favorable to the aggrandizement of the Papacy, therefore of more awful responsibility. The Cardinals who proclaimed him saluted him by the name of Innocent, in testimony of his blameless life. In his inauguration sermon broke forth the character of the man; the unmeasured assertion of his dignity, protestations of humility which have a sound of pride. "Ye see what manner of servant that is whom the Lord hath set over his people; no other than the vicegerent of Christ; the successor of Peter. He stands in the midst between God and man; below God, above man; less than God, more than man. He judges all, is judged by none, for it is written—'I will judge.' But he whom the preëminence of dignity exalts, is lowered by his office of a servant, that so humility may be exalted, and pride abased; for God is against the high-minded, and to the lowly he shows mercy; and he who exalteth himself shall be abased. Every valley shall be lifted up, every hill and mountain laid low!" The letters in which he announced his election to the king of France, and to the other realms of Christendom, blend a decent but exaggerated humility with the consciousness of power: Innocent's confidence in himself transpires through his confidence in the divine protection.¹

The state of Christendom might have tempted a less

¹ *Epist. i. et seq.*

ambitious prelate to extend and consolidate his supremacy. At no period in the history of the Pa-
State of
Christendom. pacy could the boldest assertion of the spiritual power, or even the most daring usurpation, so easily have disguised itself to the loftiest mind under the sense of duty to God and to mankind ; never was season so favorable for the aggrandizement of the Pope, never could his aggrandizement appear a greater blessing to the world. Wherever Innocent cast his eyes over Christendom and beyond the limits of Christendom, appeared disorder, contested thrones, sovereigns oppressing their subjects, subjects in arms against their sovereigns, the ruin of the Christian cause. In Italy the crown of Naples on the brows of an infant ; the fairest provinces under the galling yoke of fierce German adventurers ; the Lombard republics, Guelf or Ghibelline, at war within their walls, at war or in implacable animosity against each other ; the Empire distracted by rival claimants for the throne, one vast scene of battle, intrigue, almost of anarchy ; the tyrannical and dissolute Philip Augustus King of France, before long the tyrannical and feeble John of England. The Byzantine empire is tottering to its fall ; the kingdom of Jerusalem confined almost to the city of Acre. Every realm seemed to demand, or at least to invite, the interposition, the mediation, of the head of Christendom ; in every land one party at least, or one portion of society, would welcome his interference in the last resort for refuge or for protection. Nor did Innocent shrink from that which might have crushed a less energetic spirit to despair ; from the Jordan to the Atlantic, from the Mediterranean to beyond the Baltic his influence is felt and confessed ; his vast correspondence

shows at once the inexhaustible activity of his mind; he is involved simultaneously or successively in the vital interests of every kingdom in the western world. The history of Innocent's Papacy will be more full and intelligible by tracing his acts in succession rather than in strict chronological order, in every part of Christendom. I. In Rome, and II. In Italy. III. In the Empire. IV. In France. V. In England. VI. In Spain. VII. In the Northern kingdoms. VIII. In Bulgaria and Hungary. IX. In the Byzantine Empire and the East, in Constantinople, Armenia, and the Holy Land. Finally, X. In the wars of Languedoc with the Albigensian and other schismatics; and XI. XII. In the establishment of the two new monastic orders, that of St. Dominic and that of St. Francis.

The affairs of Rome and of Italy are so intimately blended that it may not be convenient to keep them entirely disconnected.

I. The city of Rome was the first to acknowledge the ascendancy of the new Pontiff. Since Rome. the treaty with Clement III. the turbulence of the Roman people seemed sunk to rest. As well the stirring reminiscences of their ancient grandeur as the democratic Christianity of Arnold of Brescia were forgotten. The mutinous spirit which had twice risen in insurrection against Lucius III., and had driven that Pontiff into the north of Italy, had been allayed.¹ Clement had appeased them for a time by the promise of sacrificing Tusculum to their implacable hostility; his successor Cœlestine III. had consummated or extorted from the Emperor that sacrifice.² A judicious

¹ See vol. iv. p. 439.

² See vol. iv. p. 449.

payment distributed by Clement among the senators had reconciled them to the papal supremacy. The great Roman families, though their private feuds were not even suspended, were allied to the church by the promotion of their ecclesiastical members to the Cardinalate.¹ The Roman aristocracy had furnished many names among the twenty-seven who concurred in the elevation of the Roman Lothair. Innocent pursued the policy of Clement III. The usual largess on the accession of the new Pope was silently and skilfully distributed through the thirteen quarters of the city. The prefect of the city, now the representative of the imperial authority (the empire was in abeyance), was either overawed or won to take a strong oath of allegiance to the Pope,² by which the sovereignty of the Emperor was silently abrogated. Innocent substituted his own Justiciaries for those appointed by the senate: the whole authority emanated from the Pope, and was held during his pleasure; to the Pope alone the judges were responsible; they were bound to resign when called upon by him. In his own spiritual courts Innocent endeavored to set the example of strict and unbought justice; to remove the inveterate reproach of venality, which withheld the concourse of appellants to Rome, and was so far injurious to the people. He severely limited the fees and emoluments of his officers; three times a week he held a public consistory for smaller causes; the gravest he meditated in private, and the most accomplished canon lawyer might acquire

¹ In Innocent's earlier promotions I observe a Brancalone, a Pierleoni (qu. Peter Leonis), a Bisontio from Orvieto, a Crescentius, besides several connected with the Conti. — Additions to Ciacconius.

² *Gesta*, viii. Epist. 1, 23, 577, 578. The oath of Peter the Prefect, i. 577.

knowledge from the decrees drawn up by Innocent himself. Even the commencement of Innocent's reign shows how the whole Christian world paid its tribute of appeal to Rome.¹ There was one cause concerning the jurisdiction of the sees of Braga and Compostella over great part of Spain and Portugal; a cause for the metropolitanate of Brittany between the Bishops of Tours and Dole; a cause of the Archbishop of Canterbury concerning the parish of Lambeth.

Yet neither could the awe, nor the dexterous management of Innocent, nor the wealth of the tributary world, subdue or bribe refractory Rome to peace. There were still factious nobles, John Rainer, one of the Peter Leonis, and John Capocio, a man of stirring popular eloquence, who endeavored to excite the people to reclaim their rights. Still the versatile people listened with greedy ears to these republican tenets. Still the Orsini were in deadly feud with the Scotti, the maternal house of the Pope. Still were there outbursts of insurrection in the turbulent city; still outbursts of war in the no less turbulent territory; Rome was at war with her neighbors, her neighbors A.D. 1200. with each other. Ere three years of Innocent's reign had passed, Rome, in defence of Viterclano, besieged by the Viterbans, takes up arms against Viterbo.

The Romans cared not for the liberty of Viterclano, but they had old arrears of hatred against Viterbo; and once the waters troubled, their gain was sure.² If

¹ Under the Lateran palace, near the kitchen, was a change of money, in which the coin of various countries, vessels of gold and silver were heaped up, exchanged, or sold, by the prators, for the expenses of the Curia. These "tables of the money-changers" Innocent abolished at once. — *Gesta*, xli.

² "Quod non poterant in aqua clara piscari, cœperunt æquam turbare." — *Gesta*, c. 133. October, 1200.

the Pope was against them, Rome was against the Pope; if the Pope was on their side, Viterbo revolted from the Pope. The Tuscans moved to the aid of Viterbo; but the shrewd Pope, unexpectedly, on the pretext that the Viterbans had despised his commination, and even his excommunication, took the part of the Romans; a victory which they obtained over superior forces under the walls of Viterbo was attributed to his intercession; many of them renounced their hostility to the Pope.¹ A second time they marched out; they were supplied with money by the Pope's brother, Richard Count of Sora. While the Pope was celebrating mass on the holy Epiphany, they won a great victory,² doubtless through the irresistible prayers of the Pope; it was reported that they brought home as trophies the great bell and the chains of one of the gates of Viterbo, which were long shown in Rome. The captive Viterbans, men of rank, were sent to Canaparia, where some of them died in misery. The most distinguished, Napoleon, Count of Campilia, and Burgudio, prothonotary of Viterbo, the Pope afterwards, in compassion, kept in honorable custody in his own palace. Napoleon, to the indignation of the Romans, made his escape. The Pope even mediated a peace between Rome and Viterbo. Viterbo was humbled to the restoration of the brazen gates of the church of St. Peter, and set up again some brazen vessels in the porch, which she had borne away or broken in the days of Frederick Barbarossa.

¹ "Quidam qui consueverant in contradictionem Domini Papæ ora laxare, publice dicerent, quod ita jam erant ipsorum linguæ, quod nunquam de cetero contra summum pontificem loquerentur." — *Gesta*, 133.

² This latter point rests on the authority of Ciacconius, who does not give his authority. — *Vit. Innocent. III.* p. 8. The *Gesta* makes out clearly two battles.

The Pope had the strength to decide another quarrel by sterner measures. Two brothers, lords of Narni and Gabriano, were arraigned by Lando lord of Colmezzo and his brothers, for seizing some of their lands. The Pope commanded restitution. The lords of Narni and Gabriano pledged the lands to the Pope's turbulent adversaries in Rome, John Rainer, Peter Leoni, and John Capocio. The Pope instantly ordered the territories of Narni and Gabriano to be laid waste with fire and sword, suspended the common laws of war, sanctioned the ravaging their harvests, felling their fruit-trees, destroying mills, driving away cattle. Innocent condescended or ventured to confront the popular leaders in the face of the people. He summoned a great congregation of the Romans, spoke with such commanding eloquence, that the menacing but abashed nobles were obliged to renounce the land which they had received in pawn, and to swear full obedience.¹

Another year, and now the Orsini, the kindred of the late Pope Celestine, and the Scotti, the A.D. 1292. kindred of Pope Innocent, are in fierce strife. The Pope had retired for the summer to Velletri. He summoned both parties, and extorted an oath to keep the peace. The senator Pandulph de Suburra seized and destroyed a stronghold of the Orsini. Not many months elapsed, a murder was committed on the person of Tebaldo, a man connected with both families, by the sons of John Oddo, the Pope's cousin. The Orsini rose; they destroyed two towers belonging to the senator of Rome. They were hardly prevented from

¹ Gesta, c. 134. "Adhuc eis minantibus et resistentibus coegit nobiles antedictos, ut pignoris contractu rescisso, mandatis ipsius se per omnia parituros juramentis et fide jussionibus promiserunt."

exposing the body under the windows of the palace of the Pope's brother, under those of the Pope himself. A.D. 1203. In the next year arises new strife on an affair of disputed property. The Pope is insulted during a solemn ceremonial. The Pope's adversaries make over the contested land to the senate and the people of Rome. The Pope protests, threatens in vain ; the senator is besieged in the Capitol. The Pope finds it expedient to leave the rebellious city, he flies to Palestrina, to Ferentino, and passes the whole winter at Anagni. There he fell dangerously ill.

Rome, impatient of his presence, grew weary of his absence. In the interval had broken out a new, a fiercer strife for a change in the constitution. It was proposed to abrogate the office of a single senator, and to elect by means of twelve middle men, a senate of fifty-six. The Pontiff returned amid universal acclamations. Yet Innocent so far yielded as to permit one of the Peter Leoni house to name the senator. He named Gregory, one of his kindred, a man well disposed to the Pope, but wanting in energy. Still the contest continued to rage, the eloquent Capocio to harangue the multitude. Above this anarchy is seen the calm and majestic Pope, who, as though weary of such petty tumults, and intent on the greater affairs of the Pontificate, the humiliation of sovereigns, the reducing kingdoms to fiefs of the holy see, might seem, having quietly acquiesced in the senate of fifty-six, deliberately to have left the turbulent nobles, on one side the Orsinis, the Peter Leonis, the Capocios, the Baroncellis ; on the other, the former senator Pandulph de Suburra, his own brother Count Richard, his kindred the Scotti, to vie with each other in building and strengthening their

fortress palaces, and demolishing, whenever they were strong enough, those of their adversaries. To grant the wishes of the people of Rome was the certain way to disappoint them. Erelong they began to execrate the feeble rule of the fifty-six, and implored a single senator.¹ But throughout at least all the earlier years of his Pontificate, Innocent was content with less real power in Rome than in any other region of Christendom.

II. But on the accession of Innocent, beyond the city walls and the immediate territory, all which belonged to or was claimed by the Roman see was in the hands of ferocious German adventurers, at the head each of his predatory foreign troops. Markwald of Anweiler, a knight of Alsace, the Seneschal of the Emperor Henry, called himself Duke of Ravenna, and was invested with the March of Ancona and all its cities. Diephold, Count of Acerra, had large territories in Apulia. Conrad of Lutzenberg,² a Swabian knight, as Duke of Spoleto, possessed that city, its domain, and Assisi. The estates of the Countess Matilda were held by Germans in the name of Philip, the brother of the Emperor Henry, who had hastened to Germany to push his claims on the Empire. Some few cities had asserted their independence; the sea-coast and Salerno were occupied by Benedetto Carisomi. Of these Markwald was the most formidable; his congenial valor and cruelty had recommended him

¹ "Unde populus adeo capit execrari, ut oportuerit Dominum Papam ad communem populi petitionem unum eis senatorem concedere." The last chapters of the *Gesta* are full of this wild and confused anarchy.

² Conrad was called by the strange name *Mück-in-hirn*, "fly in his brain," (like our "bee in his bonnet"); he was the wildest of these wild soldiers.

to the especial favor of Henry. He had been named by the Emperor on his death-bed Regent of Sicily.

Italy only awaited a deliverer from the German yoke. The annals of tyranny contain nothing more revolting than the cruelties of the Emperor Henry to his Italian subjects. While there was the profoundest sorrow in Germany at the loss of a monarch, if of severe justice, yet who, from his wisdom and valor, was compared with Solomon and David,¹ at his death the cry of rejoicing broke forth from Calabria to Lombardy. In asserting the Papal claims to the dominion of Romagna, and all to which the See of Rome advanced its pretensions, Innocent fell in with all the more generous aspirations of Italy, with the common sympathies of mankind. The cause of the Guelfs (these names are now growing into common use) was more than that of the Church, it was the cause of freedom and humanity. The adherents of the Ghibellines, at least the open adherents (for in most cities there was a secret if small Ghibelline faction), were only the lords of the German fortresses, the cities they occupied, and a few of the republics which dreaded the hostility of their neighbors more than a foreign yoke, Pisa, Cremona, Pavia, Markwald. Genoa. The hour of deliverance, if not of revenge, was come. Innocent summoned Markwald to

¹ "Omnia cum Papâ gaudent de morte tyranni . . .

Mors necat et cuncti gaudent de morte sepulti,

Apulus et Calaber, Siculus, Tuscusque, Ligurque."

J. de Ceceano, Chronic. Foss. Nov. Muratori, viii.

"Cujus mors Teutonicorum omnium omnibusque Germaniæ populis lamentabilis est in æternum, quod aliorum divitiis eos claros reddidit, terroremque eorum omnibus in circuitu nationibus per virtutem bellicam incussit, eosque præstantiores aliis gentibus nimium ostendit futuros, ni morte præventus foret. Per sapientiam Solomonis et per fortitudinem David regis scivit parcere subjectis et debellare superbos." — Theodoric von Esternach. Martene, Coll. Amp. iv. 462.

surrender the territories of the Church. Markwald was conscious of his danger, and endeavored to lure the Pontiff into an alliance. He offered to make him greater than Pope had ever been since the days of Constantine.¹ But Innocent knew his strength in the universal, irresistible, indelible hatred of the foreign, the German, the barbarian yoke: he rejected the treacherous overtures.² City after city, Ancona, Fermo, Osimo, Fano, Sinigaglia, Pesaro, Iesi, dashed down the German banner; Camerina and Ascoli alone remained faithful to Markwald. Markwald revenged himself by sallying from the gates of Ravenna, ravaging the whole region, burning, plundering, destroying homesteads and harvests, castles and churches. Innocent opened the Papal treasures, borrowed large sums of money, raised an army; hurled an excommunication against the rebellious vassal of the Church, in which he absolved all who had sworn allegiance to Markwald from their oaths. Markwald withdrew into the south of Italy.

Conrad of Lutzenberg,³ Duke of Spoleto, beheld the fall of Markwald with consternation; he made the humblest offers of subjection, the ^{Conrad of Lutzenberg.} most liberal offers of tribute. But Innocent knew that any compromise with the Germans would be odious to his Italian subjects: he demanded instant, uncondi-

¹ "Se ecclesiam magis quam ulli imperatores auxissent, amplificaturum." — Otto de S. Blaise, c. 45; Rainald, sub ann. 1298.

² Epist. i. 38. "Licet autem dominus Papa conditionem istam utilem reputaret, qui tamen multi scandalisabantur ex eâ tanquam vellet Teutonicos in Italia eorum fovere, qui crudeli tyrannide redegerant eos in gravissimam servitutem, in favorem libertatis declinans, non acceptavit oblata." — Gesta, Innocent, c. 9. Boehmer (Regesta, p. vii.) quotes this, among other passages, to show the barbarity of the Germans, the hatred of the Italians.

³ According to M. Abel (Philip der Hohenstauffer), properly Conrad of Urslingen.

tional submission. Conrad surrendered all the patrimonial domains of the Pope in his possession without reserve; the other cities resumed their freedom. On these terms Innocent permitted the Cardinal Legate to receive at Narni Conrad's oath of unqualified fidelity on the Gospels, on the Cross, and on the Holy Relics. He appointed the Cardinal San Gregorio the Governor of the Dukedom of Spoleto, and of the County of Assisi and its domains. Conrad retired to Germany. In person Innocent visited Reate, Spoleto, Perugia, Todi; everywhere he was received as the Sovereign, as the deliverer. The Archbishop of Ravenna alone resisted the encroachments of Innocent, displayed the Imperial investiture, and preserved the territories of his church.¹ Throughout Italy, the precarious state of the Imperial power, the sudden rise of a vigorous Pontifical administration, gave new life to the popular and Italian cause. The Tuscan League, the Lombard League, renewed their approaches to more intimate relations with the Pope; but to the Tuscans the language of Innocent was that of a master. Their demands to choose their own rectors with a sovereign Prior to preside over their League, he answered by a summons to unqualified submission to him, as heir to the Countess Matilda, and sovereign of the whole Duchy of Tuscany. "I have seen," he said, "with my own eyes, that the Duchy of Tuscany belongs of right to the Pope." Without the Papal protection the League could not subsist: he warned the cities lest, rejecting it, they should fall by the sword of the stranger.² But the most remarkable document is an address to all the

¹ Murator. sub ann. 1198.

² Epist. i. 15, 35.

cities, in which the similitude, now growing into favor, of the spiritual and temporal power to the sun and moon, the temporal only deriving a reflected light from the spiritual, is wrought out with careful study.¹ But as regarded Italy, both powers met in the supreme Pontiff. The Ghibelline city of Pisa was placed under an interdict for presuming to assert its daring independence of the League: a temporary suspension of the interdict was haughtily and ungraciously granted.

The German dominion was driven into the South: there it was still strong from the occupation of the chief fortresses.² Constantia, the widow of Henry, now Queen, or at least left natural guardian of the realm, deemed it prudent, or was actuated by her own inclinations, to separate herself from the German cause, and to throw herself and her son upon the native interest. She sent three Neapolitan nobles to demand her infant son Frederick from Iesi, where he ^{Queen} _{Constantia.} had been brought up by the wife of Conrad of Lutzenberg; she caused him to be crowned in Palermo as joint sovereign of Sicily. She disclaimed Markwald the Duke of Ravenna, and declared him an enemy to the king and to the kingdom. She commanded the foreign troops to leave Sicily; they retired, reluctant and brooding over revenge, to the castles on the mainland. She submitted to request the investiture of the realm for her son as a fief from the Papal See. Innocent saw his own strength, and her weakness. He condescended to her petition on the condition of her paying due allegiance to him as her lord for the king-

¹ Epist. i. 401, and in the Gesta.

² Epist. i. 35. "Marcualdum imperii seneschalcum cum Teutonicis omnibus de regno exclusit." — Rich. San Germ.

dom of Naples and Sicily, the patrimony of the Holy See.¹ He seized the opportunity of enforcing hard terms, the revocation of certain privileges which had been granted by his predecessors to the faithful Norman princes as the price of their fidelity. Constantia silently yielded; she received a bull, which in the strongest terms proclaimed the absolute feudal superiority of the Pope over the whole kingdom of Naples and Sicily: that extraordinary pretension, grounded on no right but on the assertion of right, had now, by its repeated assertion on one part, its feeble denial or acceptance on the other, grown into an established usage. The bull pronounced that the kingdom of Sicily belonged to the jurisdiction and to the property of the Church of Rome. The Queen was to swear allegiance, her son to do so directly he came of age. A tribute was to be paid. The bishops, under all circumstances, had the right of appeal to Rome; all offences of the clergy, except high treason, were to be judged by the ecclesiastical courts. Sicily became a subject-kingdom, a province of the Papacy, under the constant superintendence of a Legate.

Before the bull had been prepared, Constantia fell ill. Either in an access of devotion, or of maternal solicitude for her infant son, for whom she would secure the most powerful protection, she bequeathed him to the guardianship of his liege lord the Pope.² Innocent accepted the charge; in his consolatory letter to the child, he assured Frederick, that though God had visited him by the death of his father and mother, he had provided him with a more worthy father —

¹ Epist. i. 410, 413.

² Innocent, Epist. i. 322.

his own vicar on earth; a better mother — the Church.¹

Constantia died on the 27th of November.² Innocent was thus, if he could expel the Germans, A.D. 1198.
virtually King of Sicily, master of his own Death of Constantia.
large territories, and as the ally and protector of the great Republican Leagues the dominant power in Italy; and all this in less than one year after his accession to the Papal throne.³

But the elements of discord were not so easily awed into peace. The last will of Constantia, besides the guardianship of the Pope, had appointed a Council of Regency: the Chancellor, the subtle and ambitious Walter of Palear Bishop of Troja (whose brothers, and perhaps himself, were in dangerous correspondence with Markwald), the Archbishops of Palermo, Monreale, and Capua. She trusted not to the unrewarded piety or charity of the Pontiff: for the protection of her son Sicily was to pay yearly thirty thousand pieces of gold;⁴ all his other expenses were to be charged on the revenue of the kingdom. But her death opened a new scene of intrigue and daring to Markwald. He resumed the title of Seneschal of the Empire, laid claim to the administration of Sicily and the guardianship of

¹ Epist. i. 565.

² Aged 45; a year and 19 days after her husband.

³ He interfered soon after in the affairs of the Lombard League. Parma and Piacenza had quarrelled about the possession of Borgo San Domino. He commanded his legate to take counsel with the bishops to keep the peace; threatened excommunication, and ordered the castle to be placed in his own hands. — Epist. ii. 39.

⁴ The tarini varied in value. The ounce of gold, about 21 grammes, 10 cent. (French weight), was divided into 24 tarini. Its value would be about 2 francs, 63 c., 75 m. The 30,000 would amount to about 79,125 francs. M. Cherrier estimates that it would represent five times the amount in present money. — *Lutte des Papes*, ii. 40, note

the infant sovereign, alleging a testament of the Emperor, which invested him in that charge. The nobles of Sicily, however they might dread or detest the Germans, were not more disposed to be the mere ministers of the Pope. They received the Legate who came to administer the oath of allegiance with coldness; he returned to Rome. Markwald, in the mean time, had placed himself at the head of a powerful band of adventurers: he fell on the town of St. Germano, and had almost become master of the great monastery of Monte Casino, which was defended for eight days by a garrison of the Pope, and in which several cardinals had taken refuge. On the day of St. Maur, A.D. 1198. the beloved companion of St. Benedict, the serene sky was suddenly clouded; a terrific storm broke out, overthrew the tents of Markwald's army, and caused such a panic dread of the avenging saint, that they fled on all sides.¹ Innocent issued a proclamation summoning the whole realm of Naples and Sicily to arms. He reminded them of their sufferings under Markwald and Markwald's master; how their princes, and even the clergy, had been tortured, mutilated, blinded, roasted (as he says) before slow fires.² The Pope had not spared the Papal treasures: he had assembled troops for their aid from Lombardy, Tuscany, Romagna, Campania. In his warlike address to the clergy, they were commanded on every Sunday,

¹ "Cæpit more *Teutonico* in terram monasterii desævire." — Rich San Germ. ad 1198. It is remarkable that Innocent says not a word in his letters of the miracle; he ascribes the discomfiture of Markwald to the valor of the barons and knights who had taken arms on his side.

² "Vix est aliquis in toto regno, qui in se vel suis, personâ vel rebus consanguineis vel amicis, grave non incurrerit per *Teutonicos* detrimentum." — Reg. Innocent. No. ii.

and on every festival, to renew the solemn excommunication, with quenched candles and tolling bells, against Markwald and all his accomplices.¹ Markwald had again recourse to craft and dissimulation. Through the Archbishop of Mentz (who was in Rome on his return from the Holy Land) he made offers to the Pope which showed that he thought Innocent as unscrupulous as himself. He asserted the bastardy of Frederick; proposed that Innocent should invest him, Markwald, with the kingdom of Sicily. He would pay the Pope at once the enormous sum of 20,000 ounces of gold;² the like sum on being put in possession of Palermo. He would double the annual tribute, and rule the island under the absolute control of the Pope. These offers being rejected, he was seized with a sudden and passionate desire of spiritual reconciliation with the Church. It was a strange contest; Markwald endeavoring by humble civilities, by menaces, by lavish offers, to extort absolution on the easiest terms from the Cardinals. He declared himself ready to swear unreserved obedience in spiritual matters, in temporal more cautiously, to all just mandates of the Pope. Legates were sent to Veroli to receive his oath — Octavian the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Guido Cardinal Presbyter of S. Maria in Transtevere, Ugolino Cardinal Deacon of S. Eustachio. He invited them to a banquet in a neighboring convent, and Markwald himself served them with the utmost humility; but audible murmurs were heard at the close that they were to be taken prisoners, and compelled to grant the unconditional absolution. Octavian and Guido were

¹ Epist. i. 557 to 566.

² Gesta, ch. xxii.

frightened; Ugolino took courage, and produced a bull of the Pope, with which the wary Innocent had provided them, prescribing the form of the oath, which implied the absolute abandonment of the bailiwick of Sicily, restoration of the patrimony of St. Peter, compensation for plunder, especially of the monastery of Monte Casino; and, above all, Markwald was to swear to respect the persons of all ecclesiastics, especially of the Cardinals of the Church. There was a wild and threatening tumult among the German soldiery and the populace against the Cardinals. But Markwald had not the courage to proceed to violence. The Legates were permitted to return to Veroli: Markwald took the prescribed oath, and received absolution.

But the absolution thus obtained at Veroli by a May, 1199. feigned submission was soon forfeited. Markwald would not renounce, he still affected the title of guardian of Sicily: he called himself Seneschal. In this name the jealous sagacity of Innocent detected latent pretensions to the protectorate. An excommunication more full, if possible, more express, more maledictory, was hurled against the recreant German. Every one who supplied provisions, clothing, ships, or troops to Markwald fell under the same anathema.¹ Any clerk who officiated in his presence incurred deprivation. Markwald retired to Salerno; a fleet from Ghibelline Pisa was ready to convey him to Sicily. He crossed the straits; received the submission of many cities, was welcomed by many noble families, by the whole Saracen population. Innocent pursued him with the strongest manifestoes. He addressed a letter to the counts, barons, citizens, and the whole people of

¹ Epist. ii. 179; and iii. 280.

Sicily. He reminded them of the atrocious cruelties perpetrated by the Emperor Henry and his German followers; announced the excommunication of Markwald, the absolution of all his adherents from their oaths of fidelity. "He is come to Sicily with the pirate William the Fat to usurp the throne; to say of the infant Frederick, 'This is the heir, let us slay him, and take possession of his inheritance.' He is leagued with the Saracens; he is prepared to glut their throats with Christian blood, to abandon Christian wives to their lusts." Towards the Saracens, nevertheless, Innocent expresses himself with mildness; "if they remain faithful to the King, he will not merely maintain, he will augment their privileges." The Pope went further: he addressed a solemn admonition to the Saracens. "They knew by experience the gentleness of the Apostolic See, the barbarity of Markwald. They had been eye-witnesses of his cruelties, the drowning in the sea, the roasting of priests over slow fires, the flagellation of multitudes. He who was so cruel to his fellow Christians would be even more ruthless to strangers, to those of other rites and other creeds. He who could ungratefully and rebelliously rise against the son of his liege lord would little respect the rights of foreigners; all oaths to them would be despised by one who had broken all his oaths to the Roman See."¹ With still more singular incongruity, he assures the Saracens that he has sent as their protectors the Cardinal of St. Laurence in Lucina, the Archbishops of Naples and Tarentum, as well as his own relatives John the Marshal and Otho of Palumbria.² Markwald, notwithstanding these denuncia-

¹ Epist. ii. 226.² Epist. i. 489. Nov. 24, 1190.

tions and addresses, pursued his way and appeared before Palermo.

In Apulia, warlike cardinals, and even James the Marshal, the cousin of the Pope, though he showed considerable military skill as well as valor, were no antagonists against the disciplined and experienced Germans, Diephold, and Frederick Malati, who held Calabria. Innocent wanted a warrior of fame and generalship to lead his forces. France was the land to supply bold and chivalrous adventurers. Sybilla, the widow of Tancred of Sicily, dethroned by Henry, had made her escape from her prison in the Tyrol. She married her eldest daughter to Walter de Brienne, of a noble but impoverished house. Walter de Brienne came to Rome to demand the inheritance of his wife, the principality of Tarentum and the county of Lecce, which Henry had settled on the descendants of Tancred. Walter was the man whom Innocent needed. He was at once invested in the possession of Tarentum and Lecce; at the same time he was sworn to assert no claim to the kingdom, but to protect the rights of the infant Sovereign. Piety, justice and policy, equally demanded this security for the Pontiff, as guardian of Frederick; a security precarious enough from a powerful, probably an ambitious stranger. Walter returned to France to levy troops. Markwald, in the mean time, with his own forces and with the Saracens, besieged Palermo; the Papal troops, headed by the Archbishop of Naples, the Marshal and the Legate, came, the former directly by sea, to the aid of Walter the Chancellor, who had refused all the advances of Markwald. A battle took place, in which Markwald suffered a total defeat. Magded, the Emir of the Sar-

acens, was slain. In the baggage of Markwald was found, or said to be found, a will with a golden seal, purporting to be that of the Emperor Henry. It commanded his wife and son to recognize all the Papal rights over Sicily; it bequeathed Sicily, in case of the death of his son, in the fullest terms to the Pope. It commanded the immediate restitution of the estates of the Countess Matilda by the Empire to the Pope. If this will was made during the last illness of the Emperor (yet it contemplates the contingency of his wife dying before him), he might have been disposed either as leaving a helpless wife and an infant heir, to secure the protection of the Pope, and so the surrender of the Matildine territories may have been designed as a direct reward for the confirmation of his son in the Empire; or the whole may have been framed in a fit of death-bed penitence. The suspicious part was another clause, bequeathing the duchy of Ravenna, with Bertinoro, and the march of Ancona, to Markwald;¹ but even this, if the Duke died without heirs, was to revert to the Roman See.

The appearance of Walter de Brienne at the head of a small but chosen band of knights; his com- June, 1201. mission by the Pope as the leader of the faithful,² his rapid successes, his defeat of Diephold before Capua, the retreat of the Germans into their fortresses, his peaceful occupation of Tarentum, Lecce, and great part of Apulia, alarmed, or gave pretence for alarm, to the great nobles of Sicily. The ambitious church-

¹ The will is in the *Gesta*, xxvii. It is of very doubtful authenticity. Could it have been forged by Markwald, to be produced if occasion required? or was it from other hands?

² "Domino protegente fideles ab infidelibus." — *Gesta*, c. xxx.

man Walter of Troja, the Chancellor, aspired to the vacant archbishopric of Palermo. Innocent had been obliged to consent to his taking possession of the temporalities of the See, though he withheld the pallium.¹ The Chancellor had the strongest apprehensions of the progress of Walter de Brienne. A gradual approximation took place between the Chancellor Archbishop and Markwald. The Chancellor was to leave Markwald in undisputed possession of Apulia, Markwald the Chancellor in that of Sicily. The friendship was hollow and mistrustful. Each suspected and accused the other of designs on the Crown—Markwald for himself, Walter for his brother, Gentile Count of Manupelles. Both, however, were equally jealous of Walter de Brienne: Markwald as already more than his equal in the kingdom of Naples. The Chancellor assumed loyal apprehension for the endangered rights of the infant Frederick, whom the Pope, as he suspected, would betray. Innocent was compelled to justify himself in a long letter addressed to the young Frederick, whom he warned to mistrust all around him, and to place his sole reliance on the parental guardianship of the Pope. The Chancellor Walter of Troja was now in the kingdom of Naples, levying money for the service of the realm, which he is accused of having done in the most rapacious manner, not sparing the treasures, nor even the holy vessel of the churches. He might plead, perhaps, the tribute paid by the realm to the Pope. To the Papal legate, the Bishop of Porto, he professed unbounded submission, took the oath of allegiance, and received absolution. When, however, he was commanded not to oppose Walter de Brienne, against

¹ May 3, 1203.

whom he was in almost armed confederacy with the Germans, he broke fiercely out, as if in indignant patriotism: "If St. Peter himself uttered such command, he would not obey; the fear of hell should not tempt him to be guilty of such treason;" and he is said to have blasphemed (such is the term) against the Pope himself.¹ From the presence of the Legate he set out openly to join Diephold. A battle took place near Bari. Walter de Brienne, though embarrassed by the presence and the fears of the Legate, gained a complete victory: many important prisoners, among them a brother of Diephold, were taken.

But in Sicily as well as Naples the partisans of Walter of Troja, comprehending the greater part of the Norman and native nobles, were now in alliance with the Germans. Markwald entered Palermo, and became master of the person of the King. Sept. 1202.
Death of
Markwald. He died shortly after of an unsuccessful or unskilful operation for the stone. The palace and the person of the King were seized by a powerful Norman noble, William of Capperone. From him Walter the Chancellor, who still claimed to be Bishop of Troja, and, despite of the Pope, Archbishop of Palermo, endeavored by a long course of intrigue to wrest away the precious charge. In the kingdom of Naples, the death of Walter de Brienne, who was surprised, taken, and who died of his wounds² as a prisoner of Diephold, gave back the ascendancy to the German party. The Pope was constrained to accept their precarious and doubtful submission; to admit them to reconciliation with the Church. Diephold became the most power-

¹ Gesta, xxxiv.

² The battle, the 11th of June, 1205.

ful subject, and more than a subject in the kingdom of Naples.

Thus grew up the young Frederick, the ward of the Pope, without that pious, or at least careful education¹ which might have taught him respect and gratitude to the Holy See; among Churchmen who conspired against or openly defied the head of the Church; taught from his earliest years by every party to mistrust the other; taught by the Sicilians to hate the Germans, by the Germans to despise the Sicilians; taught that in the Pope himself, his guardian, there was no faith or loyalty; that his guardian would have sacrificed him, had it been his interest, to the house of Tancred. All around him was intrigue, violence, conflict. Government was almost suspended throughout Sicily. The Saracens hardly acknowledging any allegiance to the throne, warred with impartiality against the Christians of both parties; yet neither had any repugnance to an alliance with the gallant Infidels against the opposing party. Such was the training of him who was in a short time to wear the Imperial crown, to wage the last strife of the house of Hohenstaufen with his mother, rather perhaps his step-mother, the Church.

¹ The Cardinal Cencio Savelli, afterwards the mild Honorius III., had at first the nominal charge of his education.

CHAPTER II.

INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE.

THE Empire, now vacant, might seem to invite the commanding interposition of Innocent. It opened almost a wider field for the ambition of the Pope, and for those exorbitant pretensions to power which disguised themselves as tending to promote peace and order by expanding the authority of the Church, than Italy itself. But it was not so easy to reconcile these vast demands for what was called spiritual freedom, but which was in fact spiritual dominion, with the real interests of Germany. The prosperity, the peace of the Empire depended on the strength, the influence, the unity of the temporal power; the security, the advancement of the Papacy on its weakness and its anarchy. A vigorous and uncontested Sovereignty could alone restrain the conflicting states, and wisely and temperately administered, might advance the social condition of Germany. At all events, such sovereignty was necessary to spare the realm from years of civil war, during which armed adventurers grew up, from their impregnable castles warring against each other, defying all government, wasting the land with fire and sword, preventing culture, inhibiting commerce, retarding civilization. But a powerful Emperor had always been found formidable to the Church, at least to the temporal rule of the

Papacy; his claims to Italian dominion were only suspended by his inability to enforce them; and the greater his strength, the less the independence of the German prelacy. The Emperor either domineered over them, or filled the important sees with his own favorites. The Pope could not but remember the long strife of his predecessors with the house of Hohenstaufen; in them was centred all the hostility, all the danger of Ghibellinism; they seemed born to be implacable foes of the Papacy: he might naturally shrink in execration at the recent cruelties of Henry, though he could hardly augur in the infant King of Sicily so obstinate an antagonist to his successors as Frederick II.

The perpetuation of the Empire in this haughty house was in itself a cause of serious apprehension; it added immeasurably to the Imperial power, and every subordinate consideration must be sacrificed to the limitation of that power.

Immediately after the death of Henry, his brother Philip,¹ abandoning his first intention of descending to the south, and of taking with him the young Frederick, hastened to the Alps, which he reached not without difficulty, pursued, even menaced, by the murmurs and imprecations of the Italians. Already had Henry in his lifetime obtained the oath of many of the German princes to his infant son, as King of the Romans and heir of the Empire. Philip at first asserted, and seemed honestly disposed to assert

Philip retires
to Germany.

¹ Philip had been intended for holy orders, was provost of Aix-la-Chapelle, had been chosen Bishop of Wurtzburg in 1191. In 1194 he accompanied the Emperor to Apulia; was named Duke of Tuscany, 1195; married to the Princess Irene; Duke of Swabia, 1196.

the claims of his nephew ; but an infant Emperor was too contrary to German usage, manifestly so unsuited to the difficult times, that Philip consented to be chosen King by a large body of princes and March 6. of prelates assembled at Mulhausen.¹ But the adverse party had not been inactive. The soul of this party was Adolph of Altena, the powerful, opulent, and crafty Archbishop of Cologne. The great prelates of the Rhine and the neighboring princes seemed to claim a kind of initiative. The Archbishop of Mentz, Conrad of Wittlesbach, was absent in the Holy Land ;² the Archbishop of Treves appeared at first on the side of the Archbishop of Cologne. They met at Andernach, and professed surprise that the rest of the princes were so slow in joining the legitimate Diet. They determined, of themselves, to raise up an antagonist to the house of Hohenstaufen. Three princes for different reasons refused to embark in the perilous contest. Richard of Cornwall was at length conscious of his folly in aspiring, as he had too often done, to the Empire. Berthold of Zahringen, who had once yielded, withdrew from prudence, or rather avarice.³ Bernard of Saxony, as feeling himself unequal to the burden of Empire, and already pledged to the cause of Philip. The prelates turned their thoughts at length to the house of Henry the Lion, the irreconcilable adversary of the house of Swabia. Henry, the eldest Otho. son, was engaged in the Crusades ; the second, Otho,

¹ At Arnstadt, in Thuringia, according to Boehmer, Pref. p. ix. Compare the passage as to the spontaneous offer of the princes.

² Conrad of Radensburg, Bishop of Hildesheim, later of Wurtzburg, once a fellow-student of Thomas à Becket, was also in the Holy Land ; as also the eldest son of Henry the Lion.

³ Annal. Argentin.

since the house had fallen under the ban of the Empire, had resided at the court of England, under the protection of Richard of Cornwall. By his valor he had attracted the notice of his uncle, King Richard Cœur de Lion: he had been created first Count of York, afterwards Count of Poitou. Otho could not have lived under a better training for the fostering his hereditary hatred and thirst of revenge against the house of Hohenstaufen, or for the love of chivalrous adventure. He had nothing to lose, an imperial crown to win. His uncle, Richard of England, could never
A.D. 1198. forget his imprisonment in Germany, and the part taken by the Emperor in that galling and disgraceful transaction. The perfidy and avarice of Henry were to be visited in due retribution on his race.¹ Otho set forth on his expedition, to gain the Imperial crown, well furnished with English gold,² with some followers, and with provisions of war. In May he was proclaimed Emperor at Cologne; he was declared the champion of the Church: he owed his election to a few Churchmen. The Archbishop of Cologne either represented, or pretended to represent, besides his own vote, the Archbishop of Mentz. English gold bought the avaricious Archbishop of Treves. The Flemish nobles, allied with England, were almost unanimous in favor of Otho; many other princes, who

¹ By the English account King Richard by his money initiated the proceedings of Archbishop Adolph; he bought the crown for Otho: "*Rex Richardus divitiis et consiliis pollens, tantum egit muneribus et xeniiis suis erga Archiepiscopum Coloniae et erga proceres imperii, quod omnibus aliis omisissis, Othonem nepotem suum, mirae strenuitatis et elegantis corporis adolescentem elegerint.*" — Radulph. Coggeshal, ap. Martene, v. 851. Philip asserts this in his letter to the Pope. — Apud Innocent, Epist. i. 747.

² According to Arnold of Lubeck, 50,000 marks. "*Quæ in summariis ferebant quinquaginta dextrarii.*" — c. vii. 17.

had returned from the Crusades on the news of the Emperor's death, joined either from love of war, respect for the Church, or hatred of the Hohenstaufen, the growing party.

Nothing can be more sublime than the notion of a great supreme religious power, the representative of God's eternal and immutable justice upon earth, absolutely above all passion or interest, interposing with the commanding voice of authority in the quarrels of kings and nations, persuading peace by the unimpeachable impartiality of its judgments, and even invested in power to enforce its unerring decrees. But the sublimity of the notion depends on the arbiter's absolute exemption from the unextinguishable weaknesses of human nature. If the tribunal commands not unquestioning respect; if there be the slightest just suspicion of partiality; if it goes beyond its lawful province; if it has no power of compelling obedience; it adds but another element to the general confusion; it is a partisan enlisted on one side or the other, not a mediator conciliating conflicting interests, or overawing the collision of factions. Yet such was the Papal power in these times: often, no doubt, on the side of justice and humanity, too often on the other; looking to the interests of the Church alone, assumed, but assumed without ground to be the same as those of Christendom and mankind; the representative of fallible man rather than of the infallible God. Ten years of strife and civil war in Germany are to be traced, if not to the direct instigation, to the inflexible obstinacy of Pope Innocent III.

It was too much the interest of both parties to obtain the influence of the Pope in their favor, not to incline

them outwardly at least to submit their claims to his investigation. But it was almost as certain that one party at least would not abide by his unfavorable decree : and however awful the power of excommunication with which there could be no doubt that the Pope would endeavor to compel obedience, in no instance had the spiritual power, at least in later days, obtained eventual success.

Innocent assumed a lofty equity ; but the house of Henry the Lion had ever been devoted to the Pope ; the house of Swabia ungovernable, if not inimical. His first measure against Philip was one of cautious hostility. Philip was already under the ban of the Church — I. As implicated with his brother in the cruelties exercised against the family of the unfortunate Tancred, the rival favored by the Pope for the throne of Sicily. II. As having held by Imperial grant the domains of the Countess Matilda, to which the Feb. 1198. Popes maintained their right by anathema against all who should withhold them from the See. The Bishop of Sutri was sent as Legate to demand of Philip the immediate release of Sybilla, the widow of Tancred, and of her daughters, who were imprisoned in Germany, as well as of the Archbishop of Salerno their partisan. The German prelates of the Rhine were commanded to support this demand, to sequester the goods of all who had presumed to assist in the incarceration of an Archbishop, in itself an act of sacrilege.¹ The Chapter of Mentz, in the absence of the Primate, was to pronounce an interdict not only on those concerned in the imprisonment, and the whole city in which it had taken place ; but also to bring

¹ Epist. i. 24, 25.

under the ban of the Church all German princes who did not heartily strive for their release : if satisfaction was not instantly made, the ban spread over the whole of Germany.¹ Philip himself was to be reminded of his state of excommunication, as usurper of the territories of the Church. Only on his giving full satisfaction on both points, the instantaneous release of the prisoners, especially the Archbishop of Salerno, and his surrender of all the lands of the Roman See, was the Bishop of Sutri empowered to grant absolution ; otherwise Philip could only receive it as a suppliant from the Pope himself. Thus the first act of the aspirant to the Empire was to be an acknowledgment of almost the highest pretensions of the Papal supremacy, a condemnation of his brother's policy, the cession of the lands of the Countess Matilda. Innocent had chosen a German by birth, perhaps from his knowledge of the language, for this important Legation, in full confidence, no doubt, that the interests of the Church would quench all feelings of nationality. But either from this nationality, from weakness, or love of peace, the Bishop of Sutri allowed himself to be persuaded by Philip to stretch to the utmost, if not to go beyond, his instructions. Philip consented in vague words to the amplest satisfaction ; and on this general promise, obtained a secret absolution from the Legate. Innocent disclaimed his weak envoy ; afterwards degraded him from his See, and banished him to a remote monastery, where he died in shame and grief.²

¹ It is remarkable that Innocent dwells on the sins of the luxurious and effeminate Sicilians, who had been visited on that account by the cruelties of the Germans, rather than on the tyranny and inhumanity of the Germans. — Epist. 26.

² Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, i. 1275. Worms, June 29 1198.

Yet Philip stood absolved by one representing the Papal authority. This objection to the validity of his election was removed; and in most other respects his superiority was manifest. The largest and most powerful part of the Empire acknowledged him; his army was the strongest; the treasures which his brother had brought from Sicily were lavished with successful prodigality; his garrison as yet occupied Aix-la-Chapelle, the city in which the Emperors were crowned; all the sacred regalia were in his hands. The Rhenish prelates and the nobles of Flanders stood almost alone on the side of Otho; but Richard of England had supplied him with large sums of money; and with the aid of the Flemish princes he made himself master of Aix-la-Chapelle, and was crowned in that city by the Archbishop of Cologne.

July 10, 1198. Philip celebrated his coronation at Mentz, but the highest Prelate who would perform this rite was a foreigner, at least not a German, Aimo, Archbishop of the Tarentaise.

If Richard of England was on one side in this contest, Philip Augustus of France was sure to be on the other; and besides his rivalry with England, the King of France had personal and hereditary cause for hostility to Otho; and with the house of Hohenstaufen he had ever maintained friendly alliance.¹

Innocent seemed to await the submission of the cause

¹ Godef. Mon. Arnold Lubeck. See Von Raumer, iii. p. 107. Gerv. Tilb. The King of France, writing to the Pope: "Ad hæc cum rex Angliæ per fas et nefas pecuniâ suâ mediante nepotem suum ad imperialem apicem conatur intrudere, vos nullatenus intrusionem illam, si placet, debetis admittere, quoniam in opprobrium coronæ nostræ cognoscitur redundare." — Innocent, Epist. i. 690.

to his arbitration; as yet, indeed, he was fully occupied with the affairs of Rome and Italy. The friends of Otho, who could well anticipate his ^{Pope} ~~Innocent.~~ favorable judgment, were the first to make their appeal. Addresses were sent to Rome in the name of Richard King of England, Count Baldwin of Flanders, the city of Milan, the Archbishop of Cologne, his suffragans the Bishops of Munster, Minden, Paderborn, Cambray and Utrecht, the Bishop of Strasburg, the Abbots of Verden and Corvey, Duke Henry of Brabant, with many Abbots and Counts. Most of these documents promised the most profound submission on the part of Otho to the Church; specifically abandoned the detestable practice¹ of seizing the goods of bishops and abbots on their decease, and pledged all the undersigned to the same loyal protection of the Church and all her rights. The answer of Innocent was courteous, but abstained from recognizing the title of Otho.

The civil war began its desolations. Philip at first gained great advantages; he advanced almost A.D. 1198. to the gates of Cologne; and retreated only on the tidings of the approach of a powerful army from Flanders. It was civil war in its most barbarous lawlessness. Bonn, Andernach, and other towns were burned; it is said that a nun was stripped naked, anointed with honey, rolled in feathers, and then set on a horse with her face to the tail, and paraded through the streets. Philip, on his side, wrought by indignation from his constitutional mildness, commanded the guilty soldiers to be boiled in hot water. The winter suspended the hostile operations.

Philip himself maintained a lofty silence towards

¹ "Consuetudinem illam detestabilem."

Rome ; he would not, it might seem, compromise the right of election in the princes and prelates of the realm, by what might be construed into the acknowledged arbitration of a superior authority. A year had now passed ; the war, on the whole, had been to his advantage ; the death of Richard of England had deprived Otho of his most formidable ally. Innocent could no longer brook delay ; without his aid there was danger lest the cause of Otho should utterly fail. His expectations that both parties would lay the cause at his feet were disappointed ; he was compelled to take the initiative. Unsummoned therefore by general consent, appealed to by but one party, he ascended as it were his tribunal ; in a letter to the Archbishop of Cologne, though by no means committing himself, he allowed his favorable disposition to transpire somewhat more clearly. In an address to the Princes and Prelates, he declared his surprise that a cause on which depended the dignity or disgrace of the Church, the peace and unity or the desolation of the Empire, had not been at once submitted to him, in whom was vested the sole and absolute right of determining the dispute in the first and last resort. It was his duty to admonish them to put an end to this fatal anarchy. He would adjudge the crown to him who should unite the greater number of suffrages, and was the best deserving.¹ The merits of the case were thus left to no rigid rule of right, but vaguely yielded up to his arbitrary judgment. Philip, at the same time, found it expedient to announce his election, not to submit his claim, to the Court of the Pontiff.² He wrote from the city

¹ Epist. i. 690 ; date probably May 20.

² Spires, May 28.

of Spires, that he had received with due honor the Bishop of Sutri and the Abbot of St. Anastasia, the envoys of the Pope. He had only kept them in his court to witness the course of affairs. He sent them now to announce that by God's merciful guidance all had turned out in his favor, the obstacles to his elevation were rapidly disappearing; he entreated his Holiness to turn an attentive ear to their report. At the same time came an address from the princes and prelates; the list, both of ecclesiastics and laymen, contrasted strongly with the few names which had supported the address of Otho.

Philip Augustus of France supported the demands of Philip's partisans. Among the princes were the kings of Bohemia, the dukes of Saxony, Bavaria, Austria, Meran, and Lorraine, the margraves of Meissen, Brandenburg, and Moravia. The host of prelates was even more imposing. The archbishops of Magdeburg, of Treves (who had perhaps been brought back), and Besançon; the Bishops of Ratisbon, Freisingen, Augsburg, Constance, Eichstadt, Worms, Spires, Brixen, and Hildesheim, with a large number of abbots, Herzfeld, Tegernsee, Elwangen. These had signed, but there were besides assenting to the address, Otho the palatine of Burgundy (Philip's brother), the dukes of Zähringen and Carinthia, the margraves of Landsberg and Bohberg; the palgraves of Thuringia, Witlesbach, and numberless other counts and nobles: the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Verden, Halberstadt, Merseburg, Naumburg, Osnaburg, Bamberg, Passau, Coire, Trent, Metz, Toul, Verdun, Liège. There was submission, at the same time something of defiance and menace, in their

language. They declared that they had no design to straiten the rights of the holy see; but they urged upon the Pope that he should not encroach on the rights of the Empire; they warned him against hostility towards Markwald the seneschal of the Empire, and declared themselves ready after a short repose, with the Emperor at their head, to undertake an expedition to Rome in great force.¹ The Pope replied to the prince and prelates that he had heard with sorrow of the contested election; he should be prepared to join the Emperor who had been elected lawfully; he should remember rather the good than the evil deeds of the Emperor; it was by no means his desire to trench on his temporal rights, but to act for the good of the empire as of the church. They would judge better of his proceedings against Markwald, when better informed, and when they had closed their ears against the calumniators of the Roman see.

Conrad Archbishop of Mentz,² the Primate of Germany, of noble family, venerable for his age, his learning, and his character, had been absent in the Holy Land throughout all these proceedings. To him, supposing him to be yet in Palestine, Innocent addressed May 3, 1199. an epistle³ which explained the state of the contest, manifestly with a strong bearing towards Otho; he declared that all his measures were for the greatness, not, as turbulent men asserted, for the destruction of

¹ The date of this address of the German princes and prelates is of some importance. Hurter places it in 1199. It is dated at Spires, v. Kal. Jun. May 28. Georgish in his *Regesta* assigns it to 1198; but if so, it preceded the coronation both of Otho and Philip. Von Raumer places it in his text in 1199, in his note in 1198. Boehmer in 1200.

² Conrad held the cardinal bishopric of St. Sabina, with the primacy of Mentz. — *Epist.* ii. 293.

³ *Epist.* ii.

the Empire. He enjoined him to send orders to his diocese, that all the officers, the ecclesiastics, and the barons dependent on the church of Mentz, should support the Emperor approved by the Holy See. Conrad had already set out for Europe, he passed Nov. 6. 1199. through Rome; and Innocent, after a long conference, invested him in full authority to reëstablish peace in Germany. The Primate, on his part, promised to come to no final determination without sending previous information to the Pope. On the arrival of Conrad in Germany both parties consented to a suspension of arms until St. Martin's Day.

Both contending parties sent ambassadors to Innocent. Those of Otho were urgent, imploring, submissive. In every respect would the religious Otho submit himself to the wishes of the Pope. The envoys of Philip were the provost of St. Thomas at Strasburg, and a subdeacon of the Roman Church. Perhaps none of the great prelates would trust themselves or could be trusted on such a mission. To them Innocent seized the occasion of proclaiming in a full consistory of Cardinals the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power. The whole of the Old Testament was cited to his purpose. The subordination of the kingship to the priesthood in Melchisedec and Abraham; the inferiority of the anointed to him who anoints; even Christ the anointed, is inferior as to his manhood, to the Father by whom he is anointed. Priests are called gods, kings princes; the one have power on earth, the other in heaven; one over the soul, the other over the body; the priesthood is as much more worthy than the kingship as the soul than the body. The priesthood is older than the king-

St. Jam. 6's
day, July 25.

Embassies
to Rome.

May 23. 1200.

ship : God gave Israel, who had long had priests, kings in his wrath. Only among the heathen was the kingdom the older ; yet even Baal, who ruled over Assyria after the building of the tower of Babel, was younger than Shem. Then came allusions to the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, to the disunion of the priesthood by the wicked schismatic Jeroboam. From thence to modern times the transition was bold but easy. The happy times of Innocent II. and the Saxon Lothair and their triumph over Conrad and Anacletus were significantly adduced : "So truth ever subdues falsehood." The allusion to Frederick Barbarossa was even more fine and subtle. In him the Empire was united while the Church was divided ; but the schism and he who fostered the schism were stricken to the earth. Now the Church is one, the Empire divided. It concluded with the assertion that the Pope had transferred the Empire from the East to the West, that the Empire is granted as an investiture by the Pope. "We will read the letter of your lord, we will consult with our brethren, and then give our answer ; may God enable us to act wisely for His honor, the advantage of the Church, and the welfare of the Empire." In his reply to the princes of Germany, the leaning of Innocent against Philip, though yet slightly disguised, was more clearly betrayed. If he had the majority of voices and the possession of the regalia, on the other hand must be taken into account the illegality of his coronation, his excommunication by the Church from which he had but fraudulently obtained absolution ; the design to make the Empire hereditary in his house. The Archbishop of Cologne was arraigned in no moderate terms for presuming to submit the question to the

diet of the Empire without the Pope's previous consent.¹

The assembly at Boppard in the previous year had come to nothing. Otho only appeared, neither Philip nor his supporters condescended to notice the summons. Again the war broke out, and raged with all June, 1109. its ferocity. Philip fell on the hereditary territories of the house of Guelf. The Archbishop of Magdeburg burned Helmstadt; Henry, the brother of Otho, ravaged the bishopric of Hildesheim, and threw himself into Brunswick, now besieged by Philip. Philip was obliged to withdraw with great loss and dishonor; he returned to the Rhine, where his ally the Bishop of Worms was wasting the country round his Oct. 27. own city; he obtained a powerful ally in Conrad of Scharfenech, the coadjutor of the Bishop of Spire. The death of the peaceful Primate, Conrad of Mentz, destroyed all hopes, if hopes there were, of composing the strife by amicable negotiation. A double election for the primacy was the inevitable consequence of the all-pervading conflict. Hardly were the last obsequies paid to the remains of Conrad when the Chapter met. Both the elected prelates were men of noble German race. The partisans of Philip chose Leopold of the house of Schonfeld, who had succeeded his uncle in the See of Worms. Leopold was a churchman, strong in mind, strong in body, vigorous and violent; no less distinguished for the qualities of a warlike leader than an able prelate; he had been engaged in the Italian wars, and at least had not restrained his soldiers in the plunder of churches: his enemies described him as a tyrant rather than a bishop; and such was his daring

¹ Epist. vol. i. p. 691.

that he is said, somewhat later, with all the pomp of burning torches, to have excommunicated the Pope himself.¹ The opposite party elected Siegfried, of the house of Eppstein, but Mentz being in possession of their adversaries, they withdrew to Bingen to confirm their election.

Innocent now determined to assume openly the function of supreme arbiter in this great quarrel. The Cardinal Guido Pierleoni, Bishop of Palestrina, appeared in Germany with a Bull containing the full and elaborate judgment. This was the tenor of the Bull:—"It belongs to the Apostolic See to pass judgment on the election of the Emperor, both in the first and last resort;² in the first, because by her aid and on her account the Empire was transplanted from Constantinople; by her as the sole authority for this transplanting, on her behalf and for her better protection: in the last resort, because the Emperor receives the final confirmation of his dignity from the Pope; is consecrated, crowned, invested in the imperial dignity by him. That which must be sought is the lawful, the right, the expedient." Innocent proceeds to discuss at length the claims of the three kings,³ the child (Frederick of Sicily), Philip, and Otho. He admits the lawful election, the oath twice taken, and once at least freely, by the Princes of the Empire to

Pope Innocent's deliberation.

¹ Cæsar, Heisterb. Dialog. Mirac. ii. 9.

² It was the Emperor, not the King of the Germans. Innocent, in theory, held to this distinction. The Germans had full right to choose their king, but their king, being also by established usage Emperor, came under the direct cognizance of the Pope.—Epist. i. 697.

³ According to M. Abel (Philip der Hohenstauffer), the *Deliberatio* was not a published document; at all events it contains the views and reasonings of Innocent. The results were to be communicated to the Princes of the Empire by his Legates.

the young Frederick. "His cause it might seem incumbent on the Apostolic See, as the protector of the orphan, to maintain; and lest, when come to riper years, in his wrath at having been deprived of the Empire by the Papal decree, he should become hostile to the Pope and withdraw the kingdom of Naples from her allegiance to the Holy See. But, on the other hand, on whom did this election fall? to whom was this oath sworn? To one not merely incapable of ruling the Empire, but of doing anything; a child of two years old, a child not yet baptized." The Deliberation enlarges on the utter unfitness of a child for such a high office in such perilous times. "Woe unto the realm, saith the Scripture, whose king is a child. Dangerous, too, were it to the Church to unite the Empire with the kingdom of Sicily. Yet never will Frederick in riper years be able justly to reproach the See of Rome with having robbed him of his Empire; it is his own uncle who will have deprived him of that crown, of his paternal inheritance, and who is even endeavoring by his myrmidons to despoil him of his mother's kingdom, did not the holy Church keep watch and ward over his rights.¹

"Neither can any objection be raised against the legality of the election of Philip. It rests upon the gravity, the dignity, the number of those who chose him. It may appear vindictive, and therefore unbecoming in us, because his father and his brother have been persecutors of the church, to visit their sins on him. He is mighty too in territory, in wealth, in people; is it not to swim against the stream to provoke the

¹ Remark this provident anticipation of Frederick's future cause of quarrel with the See of Rome, and the blame cast on his relative.

enmity of the powerful against the Church, we who, if we favored Philip, might enjoy that peace which it is our duty to ensue?

“Yet is it right that we should declare against him. Our predecessors have excommunicated him, justly, solemnly, and canonically: justly, because he has violently seized the patrimony of St. Peter; solemnly, in St. Peter’s church on a high festivity during the sacrifice of the mass. He has obtained absolution, it is true, from our Legate, the Bishop of Sutri, but in direct contradiction to our express commands. Besides he is under the ban pronounced against Markwald and all, Germans as well as Italians, who are his partisans. It is moreover notorious that he swore fealty to the child; he is guilty therefore of perjury: he may allege that we have declared that oath null; but the Israelites, when they would be released from their oath concerning Gibeon, first consulted the Lord; so should he first have consulted us, who can alone absolve from oaths. But if father shall succeed to son, brother to brother, the Empire ceases to be elective, it becomes hereditary; and in what house would the Empire be perpetuated? — a house in which one persecutor of the church succeeds to another. The first Henry who rose to the Empire (the Pope goes back to king Henry V., with whom the Hohenstaufen had but remote connection), violently and perfidiously laid hands on Pope Paschal, of holy memory, who had crowned him; imprisoned him with his cardinals, whom he threatened to murder, until Paschal, in fear for Henry not for himself, appeased the madman by concession. The said Henry chose an heresiarch as an Antipope, set up an idol against the Church of Rome, so that the schism lasted

till the time of Pope Calixtus. From this house came Frederick, who promised to subdue the rebellious Tiburtines to the See of Rome, but retained them as liegemen of the Empire, and threatened our ancestor the Chancellor Alexander, who asserted the rights of St. Peter, that if it were in the church of St. Peter he should feel how sharp-edged were the swords of the Germans; who plotted to dethrone Pope Hadrian, alleging that he was the son of a priest; who fomented a long schism against Alexander; deceived and besieged Pope Lucius in Verona. His son and successor Henry was accursed even on his accession, for he invaded and wasted the lands of St. Peter, and in contempt of the Church cut off the noses of some of the servants of our brother. He took the murderers of Bishop Albert among his followers, and bestowed large fiefs upon them. He caused the Bishop of Osimo, because he declared that he held his see of the apostolic throne, to be struck on the mouth, to have his beard plucked out, with other shameless indignities. By his commands Conrad put our honored brother the Bishop of Ostia in chains, and rewarded his sacrilege with lands and honors; he prohibited all appeals from the clergy to Rome throughout the kingdom of Sicily. As to Philip himself, he has ever been an obstinate persecutor of the church; he called himself Duke of Tuscany and Campania, and claimed all the lands up to the gates of the city; he is endeavoring even now by the support of Markwald and of Diephold to deprive us of our kingdom of Sicily. If, while his power was yet unripe, he so persecuted the holy church, what would he do if Emperor? It behooves us to oppose him before he has reached his full strength. That the sins

of the father are visited on the sons, we know from holy writ, we know from many examples, Saul, Jeroboam, Baasha." The Pope exhausts the Old Testament in his precedents.

"Now, as to Otho. It may seem not just to favor his cause because he was chosen but by a minority ; not becoming, because it may seem that the Apostolic chair acts not so much from good-will towards him, as from hatred of the others ; not expedient because he is less powerful. But as the Lord abases the proud, and lifts up the humble, as he raised David to the throne, so it is just, befitting, expedient, that we bestow our favor upon Otho. Long enough have we delayed, and labored for unity by our letters and our envoys ; it be-seems us no longer to appear as if we were waiting the issue of events, as if like Peter we were denying the truth which is Christ ; we must therefore publicly declare ourselves for Otho, himself devoted to the Church, of a race devoted to the church, by his mother's side from the royal house of England, by his father from the Duke of Saxony, all, especially his ancestor the Emperor Lothair, the loyal sons of the Church ; him, therefore, we proclaim, acknowledge as king ; him then we summon to take on himself the imperial crown."

Innocent, now committed in the strife, plunged into it with all the energy and activity of his character. To every order, to the archbishops, bishops and clergy, to the princes and nobles, to every distinguished individual, the Archbishops of Cologne and Magdeburg, the Archbishop of Aquileia, the Palgrave of the Rhine, the Landgrave of Thuringia, the King of Bohemia, the Counts of Flanders and of Brabant, were addressed letters from the See of Rome, admonitory, persuasive,

or encouraging, according to their attachment or aversion to the cause of Otho. The Legate in France had directions to break off, if possible, the alliance of Philip Augustus with the Duke of Swabia :¹ John of England was urged to take more active measures in favor of Otho ; the Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina crossed the Alps with his co-legate the Brother Philip ; he had an interview in Champagne with January, March. the legate in France, the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. They proceeded to Liège, from thence to Aix-la-Chapelle. At Neuss Otho appeared before the three Papal legates, and took an oath of fidelity to the Pope couched in the strongest terms. He swore to maintain all the territories, fiefs, and rights of the See of Rome, granted by all the Emperors downwards, from Louis the Pious ; to maintain the Pope in the possessions which he now holds, to assist him in obtaining those which he does not now occupy ; to render the Pope that honor and obedience which has ever been rendered by the pious Catholic Emperors. He swore to conduct himself as to the affairs of the Roman people, the Lombard and Tuscan leagues, according to the Pope's counsel, as also in any treaty of peace with the King of France. "If on my account the Church of Rome is involved in war, I will aid it with money. This oath shall be renewed both by word of mouth and in writing when I shall receive the imperial crown." The Legate proclaims Otho. June 8, 1201. The Cardinal Guido departed to Cologne ; in the name of Innocent he proclaimed Otho Em-

¹ Rather later the Pope endeavors to alarm Philip Augustus. Philip (the Emperor), he says, had claimed the guardianship of Frederick II. and the possession of Sicily. If he had gained this "in superbiam elatus aliud cogitaret, et regnum Francorum sibi disponderet subjugare, sicut olim disposuerat frater ejus Henricus." — Epist. i. 717. Did Innocent believe this?

peror, amid the applause of Otho's partisans. He awaited the concourse of prelates and nobles which he had summoned to Cologne: few came; some even of the bishops closed their doors against the messengers of the Legate. Again he summoned them to Corvey, and began to threaten the interdict. From thence he went to Bingen, where he spoke more openly of the interdict. From Bingen letters were written to the Pope, describing the progress of Otho's affairs as triumphant. "Nothing now is heard of Philip and his few partisans; with him as under God's displeasure everything fails, he can gather no army; while Otho will soon appear at the head of 100,000 men." The Cardinal could hardly intend to deceive the Pope, he was no doubt himself deceived.

Philip's
Diet at
Bamberg.

At that very time were assembled at Bamberg, the Archbishops of Magdeburg and Bremen, the Bishops of Worms, Passau, Ratisbon, Constance, Augsburg, Eichstadt, Havelberg, Brandenburg, Meissen, Naumburg, and Bamberg; the Abbots of Fulda, Herzfeld, and Kempten; the King of Bohemia, the Dukes of Saxony, Austria, Steyermark, Meran, Zahringen, the "Stadtholder of Burgundy," and a number of other princes. They expressed themselves in terms of which the contemptuousness was but lightly veiled. They refused to believe (reason would not admit, loyal simplicity would not believe) that the unseemly language which the Bishop of Palestrina, who gave himself out as the Legate of the Pope, presumed to hold regarding the Empire, had been authorized by the admirable wisdom of the Pope, or the honored conclave of the Cardinals. "Who has ever heard of such presumption? What

proof can be adduced for pretensions, of which history, authentic documents, and even fable itself is silent? Where have ye read, ye Popes! where have ye heard, ye Cardinals! that your predecessors or your legates have dared to mingle themselves up with the election of a king of the Romans, either as electors, or as judges? The election of the Pope indeed required the assent of the Emperor, till Henry I. in his generosity removed that limitation. How dares his holiness the Pope to stretch forth his hand to seize that which belongs not to him? There is no higher council in a contested election for the Empire, than the Princes of the Empire. Jesus Christ had separated spiritual from temporal affairs. He who serves God should not mingle in worldly matters; he who aims at worldly power is unworthy of spiritual supremacy. Punish, therefore, most holy Father, the Bishop of Palestrina for his presumption, acknowledge Philip whom we have chosen, and, *as it is your duty*, prepare to crown him."

Innocent replied in somewhat less dictatorial and imperious language; "it was not his intention Nov. 2. to interfere with the rights of the electors, but it was his right, his duty, to examine and to prove the fitness of him whom he had solemnly to consecrate and to crown."¹ His Legates had instructions to proceed with the greatest caution, to pause before they proclaimed the direct excommunication of the great prelates of the realm. These prelates were already under the ban, which comprehended the partisans of Philip.

¹ Non enim elegimus nos personam, sed electo ab eorum parte majori, Innocent had up to this time acknowledged the election of Otho to have been by a minority) qui vocem habere in imperatoris electione noscuntur, et ubi debuit, et a quo debuit coronato, favorem præstitimus et præstamus. — Epist. i. 711.

But of the virtual or direct excommunication they were equally contemptuous: not a prelate was estranged from Philip or attached to Otho, by the terror of the Papal censures. This array of almost all the great ecclesiastics of Germany against the Pope during this whole contest is remarkable, but intelligible enough. Almost all the richer and more powerful Bishoprics were held by sons or kinsmen of the noble houses; they were German princes as well as German prelates. The survey of the order shows at once the ecclesiastical state of the realm, and unfolds the nature of the strife. The rivals for the Primacy, the Archbishopric of Mentz, were both of noble houses — Leopold of the house of Schonfeld, Siegfried of that of Eppstein. Leopold's ambition was to retain the Bishopric of Worms with that of Mentz. The Pope at once repudiated this monstrous demand, irrespective of the ulterior claims to the Primacy, which he adjudged to Siegfried. But the Chapter of Mentz, with three exceptions, were for Leopold and Philip (it was the same cause to them). Mentz long refused to open her gates to the Pope's Primate. Leopold, warlike, enterprising, restless, seems to have nourished a mortal hatred to Innocent; he threw back, as has been said, the ban of the Pope, and solemnly excommunicated the successor of St. Peter; and at length, leaving both the See to which he aspired and that which he actually possessed, he descended into Italy, in order to instigate the cities of Romagna to throw off the Papal yoke. The banner of the Archbishop of Mentz floated in the van of the anti-Papal army. In many of these cities the Bishop of Worms met with success; and hence, when after the death of Philip a general amnesty was granted

to his civil and ecclesiastical partisans, Leopold only was excluded, and abandoned to the vengeance of the Pope. Such was the state of the Primacy; like the Empire, an object of fierce and irreconcilable strife. The Archbishop of Treves, timid, avaricious, and time-serving, was on the side which paid him best. He had been inclined to Otho, then fell off to Philip. At one time he offered to resign his See, and then, being supported by the inhabitants of Treves, declared for Philip. He was excommunicated by the Legate; the Archbishop of Cologne empowered to seize his domains; yet even when he was bought to the party of Philip, he made excuses to elude a public meeting and acknowledgment of the Emperor. Adolph, Archbishop of Cologne, had raised Otho to the Empire, crowned him in Aix-la-Chapelle; he had been the soul of the confederacy; but already there were dark rumors of his treachery and meditated revolt. That revolt took place at length; but wealthy Cologne repudiated her perfidious Prelate, maintained her fidelity to Otho, declared Adolph deposed, and elected a new Prelate, the Bishop of Bonn. The Archbishop of Salzburg was for Philip; he was held in such high respect that to him was intrusted the protestation of the Diet of Bamberg; he alone, at a later period, seemed worked upon by the Papal influence to incline somewhat more to the cause of Otho. The Archbishop of Bremen in his remote diocese contented himself with a more quiet support of Philip; the Archbishop of Magdeburg was unmoved alike by the friendly overtures of Innocent, and by the excommunication of the Legate. The Archbishop of Besançon received Philip with the utmost pomp, led him to his

cathedral, and gave him all the honors of an Emperor. The Archbishop of Tarantaise had officiated at the coronation of Philip. The Bishops of Bamberg, Halberstadt, Spire, Passau, Eichstadt, Freisingen openly showed their contempt for the Papal mandates; the three latter, in defiance of the Pope, maintained the right of the Bishop of Worms to the Primacy. The Bishop of Spire seized two servants of the Pope, imprisoned one and threatened to hang the other. The Archbishops of Besançon and Tarantaise, the Bishops of Spire and Passau were cited to Rome to answer for their conduct; they paid not the least regard to the summons. The murder of the Bishop of Wurtzburg is a more frightful illustration of the state of things. Conrad of Rabensberg was related by his mother to the house of Hohenstaufen; he had been appointed Chancellor of the Empire by Henry. He was on his way to the Crusade, when he heard that the Chapter of Hildesheim had chosen him their Bishop. He fulfilled his vow. On his return he found that he had been elected Bishop of Wurtzburg. Conrad was tempted by the wealthier see, which was in the neighborhood of the house of his race. He would willingly have retained both. So important was his support to Philip, that he was confirmed in the office of Chancellor, and received the gift of the castle of Sternberg. Innocent ordered the Archbishop of Mentz to take possession of the estates of Wurtzburg; issued injunctions to the Archbishop of Magdeburg to interdict Conrad in the diocese of Hildesheim, and to command the Chapter to proceed to a new election. Yet there were secret intimations, that a man of his high character and position might find favor in Rome. To Rome he

went ; he returned Bishop of Wurtzburg ; and if not now an opponent, but a lukewarm partisan of Philip. He was threatened with the loss of his dignity as Chancellor,¹ perhaps became the object of persecution. His murder was an act of private revenge. He had determined to put down the robbers and disturbers of the peace round Wurtzburg. One of the house of Rabenberg presumed on his relationship to claim an exception from this decree : he was beheaded by the inflexible Conrad. The kinsman of the exe- Dec. 3, 1202. cuted robber, Bodo of Rabenberg, and Henry Hund of Falkenberg, resented this act of unusual severity. Two of their followers stole into Wurtzburg, murdered the Bishop on his way to church, and mutilated his body. When Philip came to Wurtzburg, the clergy and people showed him the hand of the murdered Bishop and demanded vengeance.² Philip gave no redress : he was charged with more than indifference to the fate of a Bishop who had fallen off to Otho. The citizens broke out, took and razed the castles of the suborners of the murder. These men fled to Rome, confessed their sin, and submitted to penance.³ The penance is characteristic of the age ; it was a just but life-long martyrdom. They were to show themselves naked, as far as decency would permit, and with a halter round their necks, in the cathedral of every city in Germany, through which lay their way from Rome, till they reached Wurtzburg. There, on the four great feasts, and on the day of St. Kilian the tute-

¹ Compare Innocent's letters. — Reg. i. 201 ; i. 223. He is called Chancellor at the time of his murder.

² Arnold Lubec. — Leibnitz, ii. 726.

³ Raynald. sub ann 1203.

lar saint of the city, they must appear and undergo the discipline of flagellation. They might not bear arms, but against the enemies of the faith, nor wear rich attire. Four years they were to serve, but in the garb of penitence, in the Holy Land. All their life they were to fast and pray, to receive the Eucharist only on their death-bed.¹

For ten dreary years, with but short intervals of truce, Germany was abandoned to all the horrors of civil war.² The repeated protestations of Innocent, that he was not the cause of these fatal discords, betray the fact that he was accused of the guilt; and that he had to wrestle with his own conscience to acquit himself of the charge. It was a war not of decisive battles, but of marauding, desolation, havoc, plunder, wasting of harvests, ravaging open and defenceless countries; war waged by Prelate against Prelate, by Prince against

Ten years' war.
A.D. 1198-1208.

¹ The inscription on the place of the murder —

Hic procumbo solo, sceleri quia parcere nolo,
Vulnera facta dolo dant habitare polo.

Böhmer, Fontes. i. 36.

² Thus says Walther der Vogelweide —

Zu Rom hört ich lügen,
Zwei könige betrügen;
Das gab den aller-grösten Streit,
Der jemals ward in aller Zeit,
Da sah man sich entzweien
Die Pfaffen und die Laien.
Die Noth war über alle Noth:
Da lagen Leib und Seele todt.
Die Pfaffen wurden Krieger,
Die Laien blieben Sieger,
Das Schwert sie legten aus der Hand,
Und griffen zu der Stola Band,
Sie bannten wen sie wollten,
Nicht den sie bannen sollten.

Zerstört war manches Göttes haus.

Simrock, p. 174; Lachmann, 9; Hurter, ii. 98.

Prince; wild Bohemians and bandit soldiers of every race were roving through every province. Throughout the land there was no law: the high roads were impassable on account of robbers; traffic cut off, except on the great rivers from Cologne down the Rhine, from Ratisbon down the Danube; nothing was spared, nothing sacred, church or cloister. Some monasteries were utterly impoverished, some destroyed. The ferocities of war grew into brutalities; the clergy, and sacred persons, were the victims and perpetrators. The wretched nun, whose ill-usage has been related, was no doubt only recorded because her fate was somewhat more horrible than that of many of her sisters. The Abbot of St. Gall seized six of the principal burghers of Arbon, and cut off their feet, in revenge for one of his servants, who had suffered the like mutilation for lopping wood in their forests.

Innocent seemed threatened with the deep humiliation of having provoked, inflamed, kept up this disastrous strife only for his own and his Emperor's discomfiture and defeat. Year after year the cause of Otho became more doubtful; the exertions, the intrigues, the promises, the excommunications of Rome became more unavailing. The revolt of the Archbishop of Cologne gave a fatal turn:¹ the example of Adolph's perfidy and tergiversation wrought widely among Otho's most powerful partisans. There were few, on Otho's side at least, who had not changed their party; Otho's losses were feebly compensated by the defections from the ranks of Philip. At the close of the ten years the

Innocent
obliged to
acknowledge
Philip.

Nov. 11,
1204.

¹ Two grants (Böhmer's Regesta sub ann. 1205) show the price paid for the archbishop's perfidy.

contest had become almost hopeless; even the inflexible Innocent was compelled to betray signs of remorse, of reconciliation, of accepting Philip as Emperor, of abandoning Otho,¹ of recanting all his promises, and struggling out of his vows of implacable enmity and of perpetual alliance. Negotiations had begun, Philip's June, 1206. ambassadors were received in Rome: two Legates, Leo, the Cardinal Priest of Santa Croce, Cardinal Ugolino Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, were in Worms: Philip swore to subject himself in all Aug. 1207. things to the Pope. Philip was solemnly ab-
Christmas, 1207. solved from his excommunication. At Metz the Papal Legates beheld the victorious Emperor celebrate his Christmas with kingly splendor.² From this abasing position Innocent was relieved by the Murder of Philip. crime of one man. The assassination of Philip by Otho of Wittlesbach placed Otho at once on the throne.

The crime of Otho of Wittlesbach sprang from private revenge. Otho was one of the fiercest and most lawless chieftains of those lawless times; brave beyond most men, and so far true and loyal to the house of Swabia. Philip had at least closed his eyes at one murder committed by Otho of Wittlesbach. He had

¹ Compare Otho's desperate letter of covert reproach to Innocent, Epist. i. 754. Innocent's letter to the Archbishop of Salzburg betrays something like shame, i. 748. In 1205 Innocent reproached the bishops and prelates of Otho's party — *ex eo quod nobilis vir Dux Sueciæ visus est aliquantulum prosperare, contra honestatem propriam et fidem præstitam venientes, relicto eo cui prius adhæserant, ejus adversario adhærent.* — Epist. i. 742. The Guelfic author of the *Chronicon Placentinum* (edited under the auspices of the Duke de Luynes, Paris, 1856) boldly accuses Innocent of corruption: *audiens illum potentem esse sine timore ipsius, auro et argento corruptus, &c., p. 30.*

² Reg. Imp. Chron. Ursberg. — Epist. i. 750, of Nov. 1. Compare Abel. Philip. der Hohenstauffer, p. 211.

promised him his daughter in marriage ; but the father's gentle heart was moved ; he alleged some impediment of affinity to release her from the union with this wild man. Otho then aspired to the daughter of the Duke of Poland. He demanded letters of recommendation from the King Philip. He set forth with them, but some mistrust induced him to have them opened and read ; he found that Philip had, generously to the Duke of Poland, perfidiously as he thought to himself, warned the Duke as to the ungovernable character of Otho. He vowed vengeance. On St. Alban's day Philip at Bamberg had been celebrating the nuptials of his niece with the Duke of Meran. He was reposing, having been bled, in the heat of the day, on a couch in the palace of the Bishop. Otho appeared with sixteen followers at the door, and demanded audience as on some affair of importance ; he entered the chamber brandishing his sword. " Lay down that sword," said Philip, with the scornful reproach of perfidy : Wittlesbach struck Philip on the neck. Three persons were present, the Chancellor, the Truchsess of Waldburg, and an officer of the royal chamber. The Chancellor ran to hide himself, the other two endeavored to seize Otho ; the Truchsess bore an honorable scar for life, which he received in his attempt to bolt the door. Otho passed out, leaped on his horse, and fled. So died the gentlest, the most popular of the house of Swabia.¹ The execration of all mankind, the

¹ Philip had been compelled during the long war grievously to weaken the power of his house by alienating the domains which his predecessors had accumulated. Ille cum non haberet pecunias quibus salaria sive solda præberet militibus, primus cœpit distrahere prædia, quæ pater suus Fredericus imperator late acquisierat in Alemanniâ; sicque factum est ut nihil sibi remaneret præter inane nomen dominiî terræ, et curtales seu villas in

ban of the Empire pursued the murderer. The castle of Wittlesbach was levelled with the ground, not one stone left on another: on its site was built a church, dedicated to the Virgin. The assassin was at length discovered in a stable, after many wanderings and it is said after deep remorse of mind, and put to death with many wounds.

quibus fora habentur et pauca castella terræ. — Chron. Ursberg. 311. The poems of Walther der Vogelweide are the best testimony to the gentleness and popularity of Philip. See *der Pfaffen Wahl*, p. 180; especially *Die Milde*, 184. Simrock.

CHAPTER III.

INNOCENT AND THE EMPEROR OTHO IV.

OTHO was now undisputed Emperor ; a diet at Frankfort, more numerous than had met for many years, acknowledged him with ^{Otho} ^{Emperor} almost unprecedented unanimity. He held great diets at Nuremberg, Brunswick, Wurtzburg, Spire. He descended the next year over the Brenner into Italy to receive the Imperial crown. Throughout Italy the Guelfic cities opened their gates to welcome the Champion of the Church, the Emperor chosen by the Pope, with universal acclamation : old enemies seemed to forget their feuds in his presence, tributary gifts were poured lavishly at his feet.

The Pope and his Emperor met at Viterbo ; they embraced, they wept tears of joy, in remembrance of their common trials, in transport at their common triumph. Innocent's compulsory abandonment of Otho's cause was forgotten : the Pope demanded security that Otho would surrender, immediately after his coronation, the lands of the Church, now occupied by his troops. Otho almost resented the suspicion of his loyalty ; and Innocent in his blind confidence abandoned his demand.

The coronation took place in St. Peter's church with more than usual magnificence and so- Oct. 24.

lemnity ; magnificence which became this unwonted friendship between the temporal and spiritual powers ; solemnity which was enhanced by the lofty character and imposing demeanor of Innocent. The Imperial crown was on the head of Otho ; and — almost from that moment the Emperor and the Pope were implacable enemies. Otho has at once forgotten his own prodigal acknowledgment : “ All I have been, all I am, all I ever shall be, after God, I owe to you and the Church.”¹ Already the evening before the coronation, an ill-omened strife had arisen between the populace of Rome and the German soldiery : the Bishop of Augsburg had been mishandled by the rabble. That night broke out a fiercer fray ; much blood was shed ; so furious was the attack of the Romans even on the German knights, that 1100 horses are set down as the loss of Otho’s army : the number of men killed does not appear. Otho withdrew in wrath from the city ; he demanded redress of the Pope, which Innocent was probably less able than willing to afford. After some altercation by messengers on each side, they had one more friendly interview, the last, in the camp of Otho.

The Emperor marched towards Tuscany ; took possession of the cities on the frontier of the territory of the Countess Matilda, Montefiascone, Acquapendente, Radicofani.² He summoned the magistrates and the learned in the law, and demanded their judg-

¹ Quod hactenus fuimus, quod sumus et quod erimus . . . totum vobis et Romanæ ecclesiæ post Deum debere . . . gratantissime recognoscimus — Regest. Ep. 161.

² Chronic. Ursberg. Ric. de S. Germ. spreto juramento. At Spire (March 22) Otho had solemnly guaranteed the patrimony of St. Peter. — Epist. Innocent. i. 762.

ment as to the rights of the Emperor to the inheritance of the Countess Matilda. They declared that the Emperor had abandoned those rights in ignorance, that the Emperor might resume them at any time. He entered Tuscany: Sienna, San Miniato, Florence, Lucca, before all, Ghibelline Pisa, opened their gates.¹ He conferred privileges or established ancient rights. He proceeded to the Dukedom of Spoleto, Dec. 24. in which he invested Berthold, one of his followers. Diephold came from the south of Italy to offer his allegiance; he received as a reward the principality of Salerno. Otho attempted Viterbo. He had his emissaries to stir up again the imperial faction in Rome. He cut off all communication with Rome; even ecclesiastics proceeding on their business to the Pope were robbed. Vain were the most earnest appeals to his gratitude, even the most earnest expostulations, the most awful admonitions, excommunication itself. Otho had learned that, when on his own side, Papal censures, Papal interdicts might be defied with impunity.

After all his labors, after all his hazards, after all his sacrifices, after all his perils, even his humiliations, Innocent had raised up to himself a more formidable antagonist, a more bitter foe than even the proudest and most ambitious of the Hohenstaufen. Otho openly laid claim to the kingdom of Apulia; master of Tuscany and Romagna, at peace with the Lombard League, he seized Orvieto, Perugia. He prepared, he

¹ Otho's acts are dated in almost every great city in Italy — Florence, Lucca, Pisa, Terni, Ravenna, Ferrara, Parma, Milan, Pavia, Lodi, Brescia, Vercelli, Piacenza, Modena, Todi, Reate, Sora, Capua, Aversa, Veroli, Bologna.

actually commenced a war for the subjugation of Naples. The galleys of Pisa and Genoa were at his command; Diephold and others of the old German warriors, settled in the kingdom of Apulia, entered into his alliance.

His successes in the kingdom of Naples but inflamed his ambition; he would now add Sicily to his dominions, and expel the young Frederick, the last of the house of Hohenstaufen. It might seem almost in A.D. 1211. despair that Innocent at length, on Holy Thursday,¹ uttered the solemn excommunication: he commanded the Patriarchs of Grado and Aquileia, the Archbishops of Ravenna, Milan, and Genoa, and all the Bishops of Italy to publish the ban. Otho treated this last act of sovereign spiritual authority with utter indifference. Everything seemed to menace Innocent, and even the Papal power itself. In Rome insurrection seemed brooding for an outbreak; while Innocent himself was preaching on a high festival, John Capocio, one of his old adversaries, broke the respectful silence:—"Thy words are God's words, thy acts the acts of the devil!"

But Otho knew not how far reached the power of Innocent and of the Church. While Italy seemed to submit to his sway, his throne in Germany was crumbling into dust. For nearly three years, Aug. 1209. three years of unwonted peace, he had been March, 1212. absent from Germany. But he left in Germany an unfavorable impression of his pride, and of his insatiable thirst for wealth and power. Siegfried Archbishop

¹ According to some accounts it was uttered, perhaps threatened, on the octave of St. Martin (Nov. 18, 1210.)—*Chronic. Ursberg. Ric. de San Germ.*

of Mentz, more grateful to the Pope than Otho, for his firm protection in his days of weakness and disaster, accepted the legatine commission, and with the legatine commission, orders to publish the excommunication throughout Germany. The kindred, the friends of the Hohenstaufen, heard with joy that the Pope had been roused out of his infatuated attachment to their enemy; rumors were industriously spread abroad that Otho meditated a heavy taxation of the Empire, not excepting the lands of the monasteries; that as he had expressed himself contemptuously of the clergy, refusing them their haughty titles, he now proposed to enact sumptuary laws to limit their pomp. The archbishop was to travel but with twelve horses, the bishop with six, the abbot with three. By rapid degrees grew up a formidable confederacy, of which Innocent no doubt had instant intelligence, of which his influence was the secret moving power. Even in Italy there were some cities already in open hostility, in declared alliance with Innocent and Frederick. At Lodi Otho declared Genoa, Cremona, Ferrara, the Margrave Azzo under the ban of the Empire.¹ At Nurem-^{Ascension Day.}berg met the Primate and the Archbishop of

Treves venturing for once on a bold measure, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, the Chancellor of the Empire, the Bishop of Spire, the Bishop of Basle, the Landgrave of Thuringia, the King of Bohemia, and all the other nobles attached to the house of Swabia. They inveighed against the pride of Otho, his ingratitude and hostility to the Pope; on the internal wars which again threatened the peace of Germany. The

¹ Francisc. Pepin. Murat. ix. 640. Galvan. Flamma, xi. 664. Sicard. Crem. vii. p. 813.

only remedy was his deposal, and the choice of another Emperor. That Emperor must be the young Frederick of Sicily, the heir of the great house, whom in evil hour they had dispossessed of the succession: to him they had sworn allegiance in his cradle, to the violation of that oath might be attributed much of the afflictions and disasters of the realm. Two brave and
A.D. 1211. loyal Swabian knights, Anselm of Justingen and Henry of Niffen, were deputed and amply furnished with funds, to invite the young Frederick to resume his ancestral throne.

Anselm and his companions arrived at Rome. Innocent dissembled his joy; ¹ he hesitated indeed to become a Ghibelline Pope; he could not but remember the ancient, rooted, inveterate oppugnancy of the house of Hohenstaufen to the See of Rome. But fear and resentment for the ingratitude of Otho prevailed; he
Oct. 1211. might hope that Frederick would respect the guardianship of the Pope, guardianship which had exercised but questionable care over its ward. The Swabians passed on to Palermo; they communicated the message of the diet at Nuremberg; they laid the Empire before the feet of Frederick, now but seventeen years old. Frederick even at that age seemed to unite the romantic vivacity of the Italian, and the gallantry of his Norman race, with something of German intrepidity; he had all the accomplishments, and all the knowledge of the day; he spoke Latin, Italian, German, French, Greek, Arabic; he was a poet: how could he resist such an offer? There was the imperial crown to be won by bold adventure; revenge on Otho, who had threatened to invade his kingdom of

¹ Qui licet hoc bene vellet, tamen dissimulavit. — Rigord

Sicily; the restoration of his ancestral house to all its ancestral grandeur. The tender remonstrances of his wife,¹ who bore at this time his first-born son; the grave counsels of the Sicilian nobles, reluctant that Sicily should become a province of the Empire, who warned him against the perfidy of the Germans, the insecure fidelity of the Pope, were alike without effect.² He hastened to desert his sunny Palermo for cold Germany; to leave his gay court for a life of wild enterprise; all which was so congenial to the natural impulses of his character, to war with his age, which he was already beyond. Ever after Frederick looked back upon his beloved Sicily with fond regret; there, whenever he could, he established his residence, it was his own native realm, the home of his affections, of his enjoyments.

The Emperor Otho heard of the proceedings in Germany; he hurried with all speed to repress the threatening revolt.³ As he passed through Italy, he could not but remark the general estrangement; almost everywhere his reception was sullen, cold, compulsorily hospitable.⁴ The whole land was prepared to fall off. Appalling contrast to his triumphant journey but two or three years before! In Germany it was still more

¹ Frederick had been married *at fifteen* to Constantia, widow of K. Emeric of Hungary, daughter of Alfonso King of Arragon, in Aug. 1209. Henry VII. was born early in 1212.

² Chronic. Ursberg. Chron. Foss. Nov. Murat. vii. 887.

³ Otho cum totam fere sibi Apuliam subjugasset, audito quod quidam Italia principes ibi rebellaverant mandato apostolico, regnum festinus egreditur mense Novembris. — Ric. S. Germ. Chron. Foss. Nov. Francisc. Pepin.

⁴ Gravis Italicis, Alemannis gravior, fines attingit Alemanniæ; a nullo uti principi occurritur, nulli gratus excipitur. — Conrad de Fabaria, Canon. S. Galli, Pertz, xi. p. 170. The author, a monk of S. Gall, describes Frederick's reception at his monastery.

gloomy and threatening. He summoned a diet at

March 4, Frankfort; eighty nobles of all orders assembled, one bishop, the Bishop of Halberstadt.¹
1212.

Siegfried of Mentz, now Papal Legate, with Albert of Magdeburg, declared the Archbishop of Cologne, Dietrich of Heinsberg, deposed from his see under the pretext of his oppression of the clergy and the monks.

Feb. 27, 1211. Adolph, the former archbishop, the most powerful friend, the most traitorous enemy of Otho, appeared in the city, was welcomed with open arms by the clergy, and resumed the see, as he declared, with the sanction of the Pope. War, desolating lawless war, broke out again throughout Germany. The

Duke of Brabant, on Otho's retreat, surprised Liège; plundered, massacred, respected not the churches; their

May 3. altars were stripped; their pavements ran with blood: a knight dressed himself in the bishop's robes and went through a profane mockery of ordination to some of his freebooting comrades. The bishop was compelled to take an oath of allegiance. He soon fled and pronounced an interdict against the Duke and his lands. The Pope absolved him from his oath.

Otho made a desperate attempt to propitiate the adherents of the house of Swabia. In Nordhausen he Aug. 7, 1212. celebrated with great pomp his nuptials with Beatrice the daughter of the Emperor Philip, to whom he had been long betrothed. This produced only more bitter hatred. Four days after the marriage Beatrice died. The darkest rumors spread abroad: she had been poisoned by the Italian mistresses of Otho.

¹ Ubi octaginta principes ei occurrerunt *multum flenti* et de rege *Franciæ* conquerenti . . . Ubi curiæ archiepiscopi et episcopi pauci interfuerunt, eo quod de mandato domini Papæ eum excommunicatum denunciaverant. — Rem. Leod. apud Martene, v.

Frederick in the mean time, almost without attendants, with nothing which could call itself an army, set off to win the imperial crown in Germany. At Rome he was welcomed by the Pope, the Cardinals, ^{March, 1212.} and the senate. He received from Pope Innocent counsel, sanction, and some pecuniary aid for his enterprise. Four galleys of Genoa conveyed him with his retinue from Ostia to that city, placed under ^{May 1 to} the ban of the Empire by Otho. Milan was ^{July 9.} faithful to her hatred of the Hohenstaufen; ¹ he dared not venture into her territory; the passes of Savoy were closed against him; he stole from friendly Pavia to friendly Cremona. He arrived safe at the foot of the pass of Trent, but the descent into the Tyrol was guarded by Otho's partisans. He turned obliquely, by difficult, almost untrodden passes, and dropped down upon Coire. Throughout his wanderings the Archbishop of Bari was his faithful companion. Arnold, Bishop of Coire, in defiance of the hostile power of Como, which belonged to the league of Milan, welcomed him with loyal hospitality. The warlike Abbot of St. Gall had sworn, on private grounds, deep hatred to Otho: he received Frederick with open arms. At St. Gall he heard that Otho was hastening with his troops to occupy Constance. At the head of the knights, the liegemen of the Abbot of St. Gall, ^{August.} Frederick made a rapid descent, and reached Constance three hours before the forces of Otho. The wavering Bishop, Conrad of Tegernfeld, declared against the ex-

¹ Compare letter of Innocent rebuking Milan for her attachment to Otho — *reprobo et ingrato, immo Deo et hominibus odioso, qui nunquam nisi mala pro bonis retribuit.* — Epist. ii. 692. Oct. 21, 1212. There is a very curious account of the Lombard politics on this occasion in the *Chronicon Placentinum*, p. 37. Piacenza ever sided with Milan.

communicated Otho; Constance closed its gates against him. That rapid movement won Frederick the Empire. At Basle he was welcomed by the Bishop of Strasburg at the head of 1500 knights. All along the Rhine Germany declared for him; he had but to wait the dissolution of Otho's power; it crumbled away of itself. The primate Siegfried of Mentz, secured Mentz and Frankfort; even Leopold the deposed Bishop of Worms, the rival Archbishop of Mentz, the turbulent and faithful partisan of the house of Hohenstaufen, was permitted to resume his See of Worms.¹ Frederick

Dec. 2. was chosen Emperor at Frankfort, and held
Feb. 2. his court at Ratisbon. Otho retired to his patrimonial domains in Saxony; he was still strong in the north of Germany; the south acknowledged Frederick. On the Lower Rhine were some hostilities, but between the rivals for the Empire there was no great battle. The cause of Frederick was won by Philip Augustus of France. Philip had welcomed, and had entered into a close alliance with Frederick.² The King of England, the Count of Flanders, and the other Princes of the Lower Rhine arrayed themselves
May 27, 1214. in league with Otho. The fatal battle of Bouvines broke almost the last hopes of Otho; he retired again to Brunswick; made one bold incursion, and with the aid of the Bishop Waldemar seized on
A.D. 1215. Hamburgh. But to his enemies was now added the King of Denmark. Again he retreated to the home of his fathers, passed the last three years of

¹ Leopold had been absolved before Philip's death, Nov. 1207. Epist. Innocent i. 731.

² Frederick had an interview with Louis, elder son of Philip, between Vaucouleurs and Tours, Nov. 1212.

life in works of piety and the foundation of religious houses. Long before his death Frederick had July 25. received the royal crown from the hands of May 19, 1217. Siegfried of Mentz at Aix-la-Chapelle. He was now undisputed King and Emperor, in amity with the Church; amity hereafter to give place to the most obstinate, most fatal strife, which had yet raged between the successor of St. Peter and the successor of the Cæsars.

CHAPTER IV.

INNOCENT AND PHILIP AUGUSTUS OF FRANCE.

THE kingdom of France under Philip Augustus almost began to be a monarchy. The crown had risen in strength and independence above the great vassals who had till now rivalled and controlled its authority. The Anglo-Norman dukedom, which, under Henry II., in the extent of its territory and revenues, its forces, its wealth, with his other vast French territories, had been at least equal to that of France, had gradually declined; and Philip Augustus, the most ambitious, unscrupulous, and able man who had wielded the sceptre of France, was continually watching the feuds in the royal family of England, of the sons of Henry against their father, in order to take every advantage, and extend his own dominions. With Philip Augustus Innocent was committed in strife on different grounds than in the conflict for the German empire. The Emperors and the Popes were involved in almost inevitable wars on account of temporal rights claimed and adhered to with obstinate perseverance, and on account of the authority and influence to be exercised by the Emperor over the hierarchy of the realm. The Kings of France were constantly laying themselves open to the aggressions of the Supreme Pontiff by the irregularity of their lives. The Pope with them assumed the high

function of assertor of Christian morals and of the sanctity of the marriage tie, as the champion of injured and pitiable women. To him all questions relating to matrimony belonged as arbiter in the last resort; he only could dissolve the holy sacrament of marriage; the Pope by declaring it indissoluble, claimed a right of enforcing its due observance. Pope Cœlestine had bequeathed to his successor the difficult affair of the marriage of Philip Augustus; an affair which gave to Innocent the power of dictating to that haughty sovereign.

Isabella of Hainault, the first wife of Philip Augustus, the mother of Louis VIII., had died A.D. 1190.

before the king's departure for the Holy Dec. 27, 1191.

Land. Three years after his return he de- A.D. 1194.

termined on a second marriage. Some connection had sprung up between the kingdoms of Denmark and of France. Denmark was supposed to inherit from Canute the Great claims on the crown of England; claims which, however vague and obsolete, might be made use of on occasion to disturb the realm of his hated rival; his rival as possessing so large a part of France, his personal rival throughout the Crusades, Richard of England. Richard was now a prisoner in Germany; if Philip had no actual concern in his imprisonment, he was not inactive in impeding his liberation. Rumor spoke loudly of the gentle manners, the exquisite beauty, especially the long bright hair, of Ingeburga, the sister of the Danish king. Philip sent to demand her in marriage; it was said that he asked as her dowry the rights of Denmark to the throne of England, a fleet and an army to be at his disposal for a year. The prudent Canute of Denmark shrunk from

a war with England, but proud of the royal connection, consented to give the sum of 10,000 marks with his sister. Ingeburga arrived in France, Philip Augustus hastened to meet her at Amiens; that night, it was asserted by the queen but strenuously denied by Philip, he consummated the marriage. The next morning, during the coronation, the king was seen to shudder and turn pale. It was soon known that he had conceived an unconquerable disgust towards his new queen. Every kind of rumor spread abroad. He was supposed to have found some loathsome personal defect, or to have suspected her purity; some spoke of witchcraft, others of diabolic influence.¹ He proposed to send her back at once to Denmark; her attendants refused the disgraceful office of accompanying her shamed and repudiated to her brother. Ingeburga remained in France, or in the neighboring Flanders; while the king sought means for the dissolution of this inauspicious marriage. Some of his courtiers, as might be expected, urged him to indulge his will at all hazards; others, the more sober, to struggle against his aversion. He is said a second time to have entered her chamber;² by her account to have exercised the rights of a husband, but this he again denied. Her ignorance of the language, and her awkward manners, strengthened his repugnance. The only means of dissolving the sacrament of marriage was to prove its invalidity. The Church had so extended the prohibited degrees of wedlock that it was not difficult

¹ Gesta, ch. xlvi. suggerente diabolo. Such is the cause assigned by the ecclesiastical writers.

² Asserebat autem Regina quod Rex eam carnaliter cognoverat; Rex vero a continuo affirmabat quod ei non potuerat carnaliter commiscere. — Gesta, *ibid.*

by ascending and descending the different lines to bring any two persons of the royal houses within some relationship. A genealogy was soon framed by which Philip and his queen were brought within these degrees.¹ The obsequious clergy of France, with the Archbishop of Rheims at their head, pronounced at once the avoidance of the marriage. The humiliating tidings were brought to Ingeburga; she understood but imperfectly, and could scarcely A.D. 1196. speak a word of French. She cried out — “wicked, wicked France! Rome, Rome!” She refused to return to Denmark: she was shut up in the convent of Beaurepaire, where her profound piety still further awoke compassion, especially among the clergy.² Philip Augustus affected to disdain, but used every violent measure to impede, her appeal to Rome.

Philip’s violent passions did not rest in the dissolution of the marriage with Ingeburga; he sought to fill her place. Yet three nobly born maidens refused the hand of the King of France, either doubting the legality of any marriage with him, or disdaining to expose themselves to his capricious rejection; among them was the daughter of Herman of Thuringia, Otho’s most powerful adherent in his conflict for the empire. At length, Agnes, the beautiful daughter

¹ *Gesta*, *ibid.*

² Stephen of Tournay wrote in her behalf to the Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims. His scriptural and classical knowledge is exhausted in finding examples for her wisdom and beauty. “*Pulera facie, sed pulerior fide, annis juvenula sed animo cana; pœne dixerim Sarrâ maturior, Rachele gratior, Annâ devotior, Susannâ castior.*” He adds, “*non deformior Helenâ, non abjectior Polyxenâ.*” She never sat, but always stood or knelt in her oratory. “If the Ahasuerus of France would but rightly acquaint himself with her, she would be his Esther” — *Apud Baluz. Miscell lib. i. p. 420.*

of Bertholdt, Duke of Meran, a partisan of Philip, hazarded the dangerous step. The passion of Agnes of Meran. Philip for Agnes was as intense as his hatred of Ingeburga: towards her his settled aversion became cruel persecution. She was dragged about from convent to convent, from castle to castle, to compel her to abandon her pertinacious appeal to Rome. Agnes of Meran, by her fascinating manners, no less than by her exquisite beauty, won the hearts of the gallant chivalry of France, as well as of their impetuous King. She rode gracefully, she mingled in all the sports and amusements of the court, even in the chase; the severe clergy were almost softened by her prevailing charms. The King of Denmark pressed the cause of his injured sister before Pope Cœlestine. The Pontiff sent a Legate to France.¹ The King haughtily declared that it was no business of the Pope's. The clergy of France were cold and silent, not inclined to offend their violent sovereign. Cœlestine himself wanted courage to provoke the resentment of a monarch so powerful and so unscrupulous. So stood affairs at the death of Cœlestine. Almost the first act of Innocent after his accession, was a letter to the Bishop of Paris, in which, after enlarging on the sanctity of marriage, he expresses his profound sorrow that his beloved son Philip, whom he intended to honor with the highest privileges, had put away and confined in a cloister

¹ To the same year, probably before the marriage to Agnes, belongs the letter of Ingeburga (apud Baluzium, Miscell. iii. 21). In this she asserts that three years before the date she had been married to Philip Augustus; that he had exercised the rights of a husband; that she was now a prisoner in a lonely castle; that the king despised the letters of his holiness, refused to hear the cardinals, and disregarded the admonitions of his prelates and religious men.

his lawful wife, endangering thereby his fame and salvation. The King is to be warned, that if his only son should die, as he cannot have legitimate offspring by her whom he has superinduced, his kingdom would pass to strangers. Innocent attributes to this crime of the King a famine which was affecting Sept. 1193.

France; he expresses his reluctance, at the same time his determination, to take stronger measures in case of the contumacy of the King.¹ How far the Bishop of Paris fulfilled the Pope's commands is unknown. Before the close of the year the Pope sent as his Legate to France, Peter of Capua, Cardinal of St. Maria in Viâ Latâ, afterwards known as the Cardinal of St. Marcellus. The legate's commission contained three special charges, each of which might seem highly becoming the head of Christendom.² I. To establish peace between the Kings of France and England. II. To preach a new crusade. III. To compel the King to receive his unjustly discarded wife. Innocent, in his letter to the King, is silent as to the marriage; his tone is peremptory, commanding not persuading peace. If Philip Augustus does not *humbly* submit to the monition of the legate within a prescribed time, the realm is to be placed under an interdict — an interdict which will suspend all sacred offices, except the baptism of infants, and the absolution of the dying. Any clerk who shall presume to violate the interdict is to be amerced by the loss of his benefices and his order. The hatred of Philip Augustus and of Richard was deep, inveterate,

¹ Epist. 1, cccxlv., to the archbishops, &c., of France to receive the Legate; ccclv. to the King of France. As Christ's Vicergerent the Pope is bound to enforce peace: his argument for peace in Europe is, that war may be more actively carried on in the Holy Land.

² Epist i. 4.

and aggravated by the suspicion, if not the certainty on the part of Richard, that his rival of France was not unconcerned in his long imprisonment. But at this juncture peace was convenient to Philip; he accepted the Papal mediation. Richard was more refractory; but even Richard, embarrassed with the payment of his ransom, involved in the doubtful affairs of Flanders, eager for the cause of Otho in Germany, was disposed to bow before the menace of a Papal interdict, or to conciliate the favor of Innocent.¹ A truce was agreed

Peace
between
England
and France.

upon for five years; the Legate was to watch, and visit with spiritual penalties the violation of the truce. The Crusade was preached with some success. The Counts Theobald of Troyes, Louis of Blois, Baldwin of Hainault, the Count of St. Pol, the Bishops of Troyes and of Soissons, and one or two Cistercian abbots obeyed the summons, and took up the Cross.

But to the command to receive again the hated Ingeburga, and to dismiss the beloved Agnes of Meran, Philip Augustus turned a deaf and contemptuous ear. The Cardinal dared not any longer delay to execute the peremptory mandate of the Pope. This mandate, brief and imperious, allowed some discretion as to the time, none as to the manner of enforcing obedience. "If within one month after your communication the King of France does not receive his queen with conjugal affection, and does not treat her with due honor, Interdict. you shall subject his whole realm to an interdict: an interdict with all its awful consequences." Twice before, for causes relating to marriage, Kings of France had been under the Papal censure; but excom-

¹ Epist. ii. xxiii. *et seq.*

munication smote only the persons of Robert I. and his Queen Bertha ; that against Philip I. and Beltrada laid under interdict any city or place inhabited by the guilty couple.¹ Papal thunders had grown in terror and in power ; they now struck kingdoms. The Legate summoned a council at Dijon. There Dec. 6, 1199. appeared the Archbishops of Rheims, of Lyons, of Besançon, of Vienne, eighteen bishops, with many abbots, and high dignitaries of the Church. Two presumptuous ecclesiastics, who had been sent to cite the King, were turned ignominiously out of doors ; messengers however appeared from the King, protesting in his name against all further proceedings, and appealing to the Pope. The orders to the Legate were express to admit no appeal. On the seventh night of the council was pronounced the interdict with all its appalling circumstances. At midnight, each priest holding a torch, were chanted the Miserere and the prayers for the dead, the last prayers which were to be uttered by the clergy of France during the interdict. The cross on which the Saviour hung was veiled with black crape ; the relics replaced within the tombs ; the host was consumed. The Cardinal in his mourning stole of violet pronounced the territories of the King of France under the ban. All religious offices from that time ceased ; there was no access to heaven by prayer or offering. The sobs of the aged, of the women and children, alone broke the silence. The interdict was pronounced at Dijon ; some short delay was allowed before it was publicly promulgated in the presence of the clergy at Vienne. So for the injustice of the king towards his queen the whole kingdom of France, thousands of im-

¹ Sismondi, iv. 121. See vol. iii. p. 524.

mortal souls were cut off from those means of grace, which if not absolutely necessary (the scanty mercy of the Church allowed the baptism of infants, the extreme unction to the dying), were so powerfully conducive to eternal salvation. An interdict was not like a war, in which the subjects suffer for the iniquities, perhaps the crimes of their kings. These are his acts as a monarch, representing at least in theory the national will. The interdict was for the sin of the man, the private individual sin. For that sin a whole nation at least thought itself in danger of eternal damnation.

“O how horrible, how pitiable a spectacle it was (so writes one who had seen and shuddered at the workings of an interdict) in all our cities ! To see the doors of the churches watched, and Christians driven away from them like dogs ; all divine offices ceased ; the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord was not offered ; no gathering together of the people as wont at the festivals of the saints : the bodies of the dead not admitted to Christian burial, but their stench infected the air, and the loathsome sight of them appalled the living ; only extreme unction and baptism were allowed. There was a deep sadness over the whole realm, while the organs and the voices of those who chanted God’s praises were everywhere mute.”¹

Of the clergy of France, some in servile, or in awe-struck obedience, at once suspended all the offices of the church. The Bishops of Paris (the Archiepiscopate of Sens was vacant), of Senlis, Soissons, Amiens, Arras, the Canons of Sens, being more immediately under royal jurisdiction, ventured on timorous repre-

¹ Radulph. Coggeshal. Chron. Anglic. apud Martene, v

sentations. "The people were in a state of pious insurrection. They had assembled round the churches, and forced the doors; it was impossible to repress their determination not to be deprived of their services, their tutelary saints, their festivals. The King threatened the clergy with the last extremities." Innocent rejected their frivolous excuses, which betrayed their weak faith; the Church must no longer labor under this grievous scandal; all who had not fulfilled the Papal mandate before Holy Thursday were to answer for it at Rome. But some sense of national independence, some compassion for their people, some fear of the King, induced others to delay at least the full obedience, the Archbishop of Rheims, the Bishops of Laon, Noyon, Auxerre, Beauvais, Boulogne, Chartres, Orleans. The Bishop of Auxerre was the boldest, he aspired through the King to the vacant archbishopric of Sens!¹

Philip Augustus was not of a spirit to brook these encroachments; and his haughty temper was inflamed by his passion for Agnes of Meran. He broke out into paroxysms of fury. "By the sword joyeuse of Charlemagne" (we recognize the language of the Romances of the Trouvères), "Bishop," so he addressed the Bishop of Paris, "provoke not my wrath. Yo. prelates, provided you eat up your vast revenues, and drink the wines of your vineyards, trouble yourselves little about the poor people. Take care that I do not mar your feasting, and seize your estates."²

¹ Gesta, 56.

² Gesta, Chronique de St. Denis. Among the most curious illustrations of the age is a poem, written by Giles Corbeil, physician of Philip Augustus, of 5925 hexameter lines. Corbeil was before known by poems on subjects relating to his profession. This new poem has but recently come to light;

He swore that he had rather lose half his dominions than part from Agnes of Meran, who was flesh of his flesh. He expelled many of the ecclesiastics, who dared to obey the Pope, from their benefices, and escheated all their property. The King's officers broke into the palace of the Bishop of Senlis, carried off his horses, habiliments, and plate. Ingeburga was seized, dragged from her cloister, and imprisoned in the strong castle of Etampes.¹ But the people, oppressed by the heavy exactions of Philip Augustus, loved him not; their affections, as well as their religious feelings, were with the clergy. The barons and high vassals threatened;

it was written probably under Honorius III. about 1219, but refers to the times of Innocent. It is a furious satire against the pride, luxury, and ir-religiousness of the French hierarchy. The Legate under Innocent, Cardinal Gualo of Vercelli, is not spared:—

“Guttur pomposo tumido Galone relicto,
 Qui Gallicanum, Crasso felicius, aurum
 Sorbuit, argento mensas spoliavit, et omnes
 Divitias rapuit, harpye more rapacis;
 Qui culicem colando volens glutire camelum,
 Imposuit collis onus importabile nostris,
 Tollere cum non posset idem, digitoque movere;
 Qui tantis iterum laqueis moderamine nullo
 Strinxit et arctavit, cætus prohibendo solutos,
 Quod sacra conjugii plerique refragula frangunt
 Per fas atque nefas, sine lege vel ordine currunt,
 Atque vias veteres recolunt, dudumque sepultos
 Enormes renovant antiqui temporis actus:
 Et pejus faciunt, pravusque repullulat error.
 Quæ quamvis prohibenda forent, quia talia prorsus
 Mactat et elidit divini regula juris.
 Ipsa tamen, posito cunctis moderamine rebus,
 Simplicibus verbis, hortatibus atque modestis
 Extirpari debuerant, anathemate dempto.”

In the account of this poem, by M. V. Le Clerc, in the xx. tome of the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, will be found ample illustrations of this speech of Philip Augustus; on the dress, the table, the habit and manners of the hierarchy. The poem is called “*Gera Pigra*,” *Ἰερα πικρα*,” p. 337, *et seq.*

¹ Addition à *Chronique de St. Denis*.

they actually began to rise up in arms. Innocent might seem to have acted with sagacious policy, and to have taken the wise course to humiliate the King of France. With strange mercy, while he smote the innocent subjects of Philip, the more awful sentence of personal excommunication was still suspended over the King's head and that of Agnes of Meran; it was reserved for a last, a more crushing blow, but one perhaps which might have led to perilous consequences. He had even (he boasts of his lenity) spared the uncle of the King, the Archbishop of Rheims, who had dared to pronounce the dissolution of the marriage.¹

Philip, alarmed at the mutinous movements among the people, at length sent certain ecclesiastics and knights to Rome, to complain of the harsh proceedings of the Legate; to declare himself ready to give sureties that he would abide by the sentence of the Pope. "What sentence?" sternly exclaimed the Pope, "that which has been already delivered, or that which is to be delivered? He knows our decree: let him put away his concubine, receive his lawful wife, reinstate the bishops whom he has expelled, and give them satisfaction for their losses; then we will raise the interdict, receive his sureties, examine into the alleged relationship, and pronounce our decree." The answer went to the heart of Agnes of Meran; it drove the king to fury. "I will turn Mohammedan! Happy Saladin, he has no Pope above him!" But without the support of the princes and prelates of the realm even the haughty Philip Augustus must bow. He summoned a

¹ Nec in personam subintroducæ, vel tuam sententiam aliquam proferendam duxerimus, sed terram tantum post frequentes commonitiones subiecimus interdicto. — Epist. v. 50.

parliament at Paris; it was attended by all the great vassals of the crown. Agnes appeared in her beauty, as when she had distributed the prizes of valor at Compiègne; in her sadness (says a chronicler of the day),¹ like the widow of Hector before the Greeks (she was far gone with child). The barons sat mute, not a sword flashed from its scabbard. "What is to be done?" demanded the King. "Obey the Pope, dismiss Agnes, receive back Ingeburga." So appalled were the nobles of France by the Papal interdict. The King turned bitterly to the Archbishop of Rheims, and demanded whether the Pope had declared his dissolution of the marriage a mockery. The prelate denied it not. "What a fool wert thou, then, to utter such a sentence!" The King sent a new embassy to Rome. Agnes of Meran addressed a touching epistle to the Pope. "She, a stranger, the daughter of a Christian prince, had been married, young and ignorant of the world, to the King, in the face of God and of the Church; she had borne him two children. She cared not for the crown, it was on her husband that she had set her love. Sever me not from him." The inflexible Pope deigned no reply. Innocent sent the Cardinal of Ostia, a kinsman of the King of France, one of his most trusted counsellors, in compliance with the King's suppliant request, as the Legate to France. His instructions were full and explicit: he was to demand complete satisfaction for the dispossessed clergy, the banishment of the concubine ("the German adul-

¹ Gul. Brito. I have consulted Capefigue's *Philippe Auguste*, but with the care with which it is necessary to read that rapid but inexact writer. This, however, was his first and best work. There are some important letters on the subject in Langebek. *Rerum Danicarum Scriptores*.

teress" she is called by some of the coarser writers), not only from the palace but from the realm; the public reception of Ingeburga; an oath and sureties to abide by the sentence of the Church. The Cardinals (Octavian of Ostia was accompanied by John of Colonna) were received in France in a kind of trembling yet undisguised triumph; they came to deliver the land from its curse. At Vezelay they were met by the great prelates and clergy of the realm; the King received them at Sens with the utmost respect; he promised satisfaction to the Churchmen, was reconciled to the Bishops of Paris and Soissons. To the King's castle of St. Leger came the cardinals, the prelates; and in their train Ingeburga. The people thronged round the gates: but the near approach of Ingeburga seemed to rouse again all the King's insuperable aversion.¹ The Cardinals demanded that the scene of reconciliation should be public; the negotiation was almost broken off; the people were in wild despair. At last the King seemed to master himself for a strong effort. With the Legates and some of the churchmen he visited her in her chamber. The workings of his countenance betrayed the struggle within: "The Pope does me violence," he said. "His Holiness requires but justice," answered Ingeburga. She was led forth, presented to the Council in royal apparel; a faithful knight Council at Sens, Sept 7, 1200. of the King came forward, and swore that the King would receive and honor her as Queen of France. At that instant the clanging of the bells proclaimed the raising of the interdict. The curtains were withdrawn from the images, from the crucifixes; the doors of the churches flew open, the multitudes streamed

¹ Epist. iii. 140. Apud du Theil.

in to satiate their pious desires, which had been suppressed for seven months. The news spread throughout France; it reached Dijon in six days, where the edict first proclaimed was abrogated in form. Nothing, however, could induce Philip Augustus to live with Ingeburga as his wife. He severed himself from Agnes of Meran, now a third time about to become a mother. It is said that at their parting interview their passionate kisses, sobs, and mutual protestations were heard. Her pregnancy was so far advanced that she could not leave the kingdom; she retired to a castle in Normandy; the serfs were said to see her pale form wandering, with wild gestures and dishevelled hair, upon the battlements. She brought forth a son in sorrow; he received the fitting name of Tristan.

The Legates appointed a Council for the solemn adjudication of the cause. It was to meet at Soissons at a time fancifully fixed at six months, six days, and six hours from the date of the summons. The King of Denmark and the Archbishop of Lund were cited to the support of the cause of the Danish princess. But in the mean time, with all outward show of honor, Ingeburga was but a more stately prisoner. She complained to the Pope of the favor shown by the Legate to the King: Octavian had been flattered and softened by the recognition of his relationship to Philip. Innocent himself addressed the cardinals in language, which delicately suggested his dissatisfaction. If the Pope was not yet content with his victory over the King, the prelates, and clergy, who had refused instantaneous and complete obedience to the interdict, must be punished with the most abject humiliation. The Archbishop of Rheims, the Bishops of Chartres, of

Orleans, Melun, Noyon, Beauvais, and Auxerre were compelled to appear at Rome (the aged and the infirm were alone permitted to appear by their proctors) to express their contrition and obtain absolution at the feet of the Pontiff. The Pope prohibited the promotion of Hugo, the refractory Bishop of Auxerre, to the Archbishopric of Sens.¹

The Council of Soissons met at the appointed time in great pomp. The Cardinal Octavian pre-
Council of Soissons.
 sided at first, without awaiting the arrival Mar. 2, 1201. of the Cardinal of St. Paul. The King entered the city on one side; Ingeburga took up her dwelling in the convent of Notre Dame. She was received with the honors of a Queen. On the side of the King appeared a great number of learned lawyers, who pleaded at considerable length the nullity of the marriage; the Archbishop of Lund and the Danish ambassadors declared that they were present when the messengers of Philip demanded Ingeburga in marriage; having sworn in his name that he would marry her and crown her as soon as she entered his realm. They produced the oath. "We arraign you, King of France! therefore, of perjury, of breach of faith; we appeal from the Lord Octavian, your kinsman, in whom we have no trust, to the Pope." Octavian requested them to await the arrival of the Cardinal of St. Paul. "We have appealed to the Pope," they said, and departed. But on the arrival of the Cardinal John the cause went on. Ten bishops and several abbots pleaded for Ingeburga. But an unknown champion appeared in the lists,² and bore

¹ Gesta, lvii.

² Roger Hoveden.

away the prize in defence of the injured beauty, Agnes of Meran. He was an ecclesiastic of unpretending demeanor, but such was the perspicuity, the learning, and the fervor of his speech, that the assembly sat in wonder. He disappeared at the end. So ran the legend of this unknown priest, who came to the rescue of the Queen of France. But there seemed no end to the inexhaustible arguments — they had sat fourteen days; the cardinals, the audience showed signs of impatience: they were strangely and suddenly released. One morning the King rode up to the Council; he declared that he would receive and live with Ingeburga as his wife. At once she was mounted behind him; and the King rode off with his hated spouse through the wondering streets, without bidding farewell to the perplexed cardinals. The Council was at an end. The Cardinal John returned to Rome. The Cardinal Octavian remained in France.

The motive of this extraordinary act of Philip Augustus was unknown in his own days. But in all probability he was informed that his beloved Agnes of Meran was, if not actually dying, not likely to live. Some superstitious fears arising from her death, some remorse which might awaken in the hour of affliction, some desire to propitiate the Church towards the object of his love, and to procure availing prayers for her salvation; above all, that which lay nearest to his heart, and was the object which he pressed most earnestly soon after her death, the legitimization by the Pope of the children which she had borne him, may have determined the impetuous monarch to this sudden change, if not of feeling, of conduct. To the legitimization of his sons the Pope consented. But

whatever his motive, Philip could not, or would not conquer his inconceivable aversion to the person of Ingeburga. To the Pope he declared repeatedly that nothing but witchcraft could be the cause.¹ The Pope, in language somewhat remarkable, urged the King to prepare himself by prayer, by alms, and by the sacrament, in order to dissolve the spell.² But in a more dignified letter, he enjoins him at least to treat her with the respect due to the descendant of kings, to the sister of a king, the wife of a king, the daughter of a king. Philip Augustus obeyed not; he eluded even this command. Ingeburga was led from castle to castle, from cloister to cloister; she was even deprived of the offices of religion, her only consolation; her bitter complaints still reached Rome; still new remonstrances were made by Innocent; till her voice seems to have been drowned in the wars of France and England, of Philip Augustus and John; and Innocent in his new function of mediator between or rather dictator to these rival monarchs, seemed to forget the neglected and persecuted Queen. Many years after Philip is said to have made her his Queen in all outward honors, but even then she was not his wife.³

¹ See in the *Grande Chronique* what the monks made of this. "*Un vieux clerc*" (how came he there?) "*avait vu le diable tout rouge . . . flâtrant sur les genoux de la reine, faisant postures et mines horribles.*"

² *Epist.* x. 176.

³ *Grandes Chroniques*, sub ann. 1213.

Gateways Community Library

Gateway Seminary Library

From the library of
W. Morgan Patterson
1925-2010



Gift of Ernestine North Patterson

